

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XI.—No. 42.

APRIL, 1935.

THE CHURCHYARD-SCENE IN SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET*, v. i. AN AFTERTHOUGHT?

BY LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING

NOT much sagacity is needed to discover a curious discrepancy in the fifth act of *Hamlet*. From the last scene but one of the fourth act the spectator has understood that the King's plan in sending the hero to England has miscarried. Hamlet's letter which bears this news to his friend Horatio is, however, couched in very cautious terms. It is true that it describes the fight with the pirates and its unexpected end, but of Hamlet's discovery of the King's murderous plans which preceded it and the turn it gave them very little is said. Some dark innuendos, however, cannot fail to make Horatio most anxious to know what has happened to his friend the prince. Moreover, Hamlet himself seems to burn with the desire to forgather with him and to tell him all about his exciting experiences. For although he has already made up his mind to return to the royal court on the following day, as his simultaneous letter to the King informs the audience shortly afterwards, he implores Horatio to accompany the bearers of his letter to the place from where he sent them. Horatio's answer leaves no doubt that he is going to obey this order and to hurry to him on the spot.

But what do we find in the next scene which shows us the two friends together (v. i.)? Does the prince give a description of his dreadful adventure, the friend listening to him with breathless

attention? By no means! Rather on the occasion of a walk which it seems Hamlet had taken with his friend Horatio, they come into a churchyard ("Churchyard," by the way, is a stage direction of Capell's, whereas Rowe took the place to be intended for the church itself—evidently because the grave-digger or first clown in comparing the stability of the gallows with that of the grave—v. i. 55—*brevi manu* identifies it with "the Church"). But church or churchyard, how did Hamlet get there? What was his intention in choosing either? Did he perhaps select a particularly out of the way place to confide to Horatio the secret of the king's insidious plans, which a miraculous concatenation of circumstances had allowed him to frustrate? If so he must in the meantime have completely changed his intention, for instead of the revelations about his personal fate which Horatio, we should think, awaited most eagerly, he treats him to a number of more or less brilliant observations on the transitoriness of all human splendour, sounds the grave-digger as to the secrets of his profession with regard to the decay of corpses, tries to outdo him in witty repartees, and indulges in philosophical reflections about the dust that was Alexander. In the terrible crisis which he has just escaped by the skin of his teeth he, as well as his friend Horatio, seems to have lost all interest whatsoever. The appearance of the procession of the mourners then turns his thoughts into another direction. What follows is the passionate scene near and in Ophelia's grave. That the burial is that of Ophelia he realises but slowly and without any help from Horatio. It is strange that Hamlet should not have heard before of so important an event as Ophelia's death; evidently we have to imagine him as but newly arrived, Horatio having joined him while he too was still uninformed of the sad occurrence. But assuming that both had been together for a good while already, it is difficult to understand why Hamlet waited so long in making Horatio acquainted with what happened. For not until he appears a second time on the stage with him (v. ii.) does he give him the expected report which he seemed so impatient to communicate before. (Cf. "Repair thou to me with as much haste as thou would'st fly death. I have words to speak in thine ear will make thee dumb, yet are they much too light for the bore of the matter.")

Now an orthodox mind would probably find the solution of this difficulty in stating that Hamlet in dropping his purpose in such a way in order to yield to his philosophical propensities simply remains

true to his part. For is not a certain instability the leading feature in his character? Several facts, however, which force themselves upon the reader speak against this explanation. In the first place, what we have pointed out represents a serious flaw in the composition. For the report of Hamlet's adventures would be received with the most intense attention if it followed the unexpected news of his return and the announcement of the King's fresh plan to destroy him. But it loses a great deal of its dramatic interest and grows somewhat stale by the delay in telling, the action having progressed meanwhile and other things having come into the foreground. But if this argument be not sufficient to prove that something must be wrong with the composition of these scenes, there are other points that lead to the same conclusion. It is strange, *e.g.*, that after Hamlet has made his disclosures to Horatio the first words of the King's messenger Osric, who addresses him, should be: "Your lordship is right welcome back to Denmark" (v. ii. 81), although Hamlet, as we all know, had, since his return, already met the King and the Court at Ophelia's grave. But even if this curiously belated welcome ought to be entered to the credit of the over-ceremonious courtier, how could it come into his mind to inform Hamlet a few sentences later: "Sir, here is newly come to court Laertes," etc. (v. ii. 110). For nobody knew better than Hamlet that Laertes had returned from France, and the spectator has seen both wrestling in Ophelia's grave.

Now let us assume for a moment that the churchyard scene (v. i.) did not yet exist at a time when the rest of the play was completed and these discrepancies will explain themselves easily. For in this case Hamlet did *not* get into touch with the court until Osric appeared before him, sent by the King to salute his stepson on Danish soil and to deliver his message to him. No wonder, then, that Osric should preface his message with the words "Your lordship is right welcome back to Denmark" and that he should inform the prince officially of Laertes' return.

It is interesting to see that the performers of the drama, if we can trust the first Quarto, recognized a difficulty in this part of the text and tried to get over it by a slight change, *viz.* by making Horatio tell the Queen in a few words (ll. 1747, *seq.*) from the letter he had received from Hamlet about "the subtle treason that the King had plotted" (whereas Hamlet's psychologically improbable letter to the King in which he hastens to inform his would-be murderer of his

return is not mentioned). At the same time the first Quarto makes Horatio communicate to the Queen that Hamlet "appointed me to meet him on the east side of the city to-morrow morning" (ll. 1748-1763), a valuable piece of information which, however darkly, foreshadows an impending meeting between the two friends far outside the premises of the court, so that the spectator is not as unprepared as in the orthodox version of the Hamlet text to see the prince and Horatio turn up in a churchyard. The curious contradiction of Q2 and F that Hamlet after the quarrel in the churchyard should be "welcomed" in Denmark is consistently avoided in Q1, and so is the superfluous information about Laertes' return to the court.

If these circumstances seem to suggest that the churchyard scene (v. i.) was indeed inserted by Shakespeare after the rest of the play was as good as completed, some conspicuous points in this scene itself also suggest a later date. To realize this one has only to think of the much discussed discrepancy in the statements about Hamlet's age. In fact no diversity of opinion in this respect would exist were it not for the passage in this very scene. For nobody can doubt that Hamlet in the beginning of the play is conceived as a young man. He has—as has often been stated—just left the university, and his love for Ophelia is described by Laertes as "a violet in the youth of primy nature" (i. iii. 7). The whole psychological crisis, moreover, which the hero undergoes presupposes the infinite disappointment of an idealism of such passionate kind as is only found in a certain youthful stage of mental development. The passages in v. i. on the other hand show that Hamlet is considered a man of thirty years. In vain it has been attempted to explain the deposition of the grave-digger away by suggesting that the figures of the MS. have been wrongly rendered in the text. It is, on the contrary, quite evident that the author *intends* to drive it home to his audience that the hero is thirty years of age, for in order to exclude any doubt and to ensure the hearer's appreciation of the point, he uses a double way, first by stating the duration of the grave-digger's employment, then the number of years that Yorick has been dead. Why else are these precise pieces of information given, than in order to fix Hamlet's age unmistakably? But the Shakespeare who in this manner made his hero a man of thirty no longer looked at his work with the eyes of the dramatist who in starting the tragedy had conceived of Hamlet

as a young man. Evidently then some time must have passed between the composition of the bulk of the play and the insertion of the graveyard scene. Meanwhile the personality of the hero appeared to him in a somewhat different light. Besides, after having made him a vessel into which he had poured so much wisdom and sceptical experience of the world, after making him a censor of morals who subjects his whole surroundings to his ethical judgment, he appeared in the end as of greater maturity, and he found it necessary to emphasize this circumstance to his audience. (Here again the performers refused to follow him and avoided the inconsistency of his text, cf. Q1, l. 1922: "this dozen yeare.")

Now it might be asked—even granted that some points in this scene are at variance with the rest of the play—are there not on the other hand distinct and necessary links visible that connect the churchyard scene with the rest of the play? It is true that there are such links, but it is equally true that they are not above suspicion and that one of the two gives the impression of being later patchwork. It is the remark that Hamlet addresses to Horatio concerning the quarrel which he had with Laertes in the (supposedly new) scene. The declaration

But I am very sorry, good Horatio,
That to Laertes I forgot myself, etc. (v. ii. 73)

is not only strangely unconnected with the preceding words:

. . . the interim is mine;
And a man's life's no more than to say "One"

but it is wanting in Q2 altogether, and only F1 gives it! As, however, Q1 contains it also, though not literally, there must have been something like it in Shakespeare's MS. or at least in the prompt copy. It is, in fact, one of those passages of F1 the absence of which in the good Q2 Dover Wilson tries to explain in his *Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and the Problems of its Transmission* (1934) vol. I, on pp. 93 seq., by the "undue haste on the part of the compositor." But most likely, being "unduly hasty," the compositor was especially liable to omitting parts of the text which were later additions by Shakespeare's or other people's hands and penned in such a way (on the margin or on an added slip of paper?) that they did not easily catch his eye.

Another passage which might be considered as a link between the churchyard scene and the other parts of the drama seems, to

say the least of it, not altogether free from ambiguity. It consists of Hamlet's statement at the beginning of the fencing-match in which he craves his adversary's pardon in the magnanimous and noble words which explain his behaviour as being due to a mental illness which he is not master of but which most cruelly masters him: "His madness is poor Hamlet's enemy," etc. (v. ii. 238 *seq.*). Now what does Hamlet think of here in mentioning actions of his which did "roughly awake [Laertes'] nature, honour and exception"? The impressive scene of his wrangle with Laertes in Ophelia's grave is still so fresh upon the reader's or spectator's mind when these words are uttered that (from Steevens 1778 on) editors have overrated the importance of the occurrence in the churchyard which means little compared with the murder of Polonius. What one has to keep in mind is rather that this is the first time that Hamlet is to meet in a—seemingly—friendly forgathering the man whose father he has killed in his absence. No wonder in these circumstances that his first step should be to give something like an explanation to the injured son. (It is this that the Queen seems to expect from him in sending him word "to use some gentle entertainment to Laertes.") Does the wording of his declaration contradict this conception? By no means, for Hamlet is concerned with Laertes' "nature, honour and exception" (v. ii. 242). Now Laertes' "nature" and "honour" are at stake, because it is his duty to seek revenge for his father—that is what we hear again and again in the play. That this point is really meant becomes, moreover, abundantly clear from Laertes' instant reply to Hamlet's words. It is true that there remains the word "exception" = "disapproval" in the prince's harangue which may or may not refer to Laertes' attitude in respect to Hamlet's behaviour in the churchyard. But it is to be kept in mind that no word of the whole speech refers distinctly and unmistakably to the scene in the grave. On the other hand the expression "purposed evil" does not fit the wrangling scene and the simile used at the end "that I have shot mine arrow o'er the house and hurt my brother" seems again quite plainly to point to Polonius' death and to characterise it as an unfortunate accident. One who "shoots over the house" cannot be accused of having intended to kill a man: *just as little—this is the implication—did Hamlet intend to kill Polonius in cold blood behind the arras.* So not even this passage contains a certain and unmistakable link with the churchyard scene.

To answer the obvious question why Shakespeare inserted the scene at all one must examine what the play gains by it. Now it is easy to imagine the mental attitude of the dramatist on re-reading the drama which he had finished—say some months before—*without* the churchyard scene. It is a commonplace of *Hamlet* criticism that on the whole that part of the drama that follows upon the marvellous scene in which Hamlet dashed his mother's moral dignity to pieces (III. iv.) shows a noticeable decline in dramatic interest and force, compared with the first acts. There are, indeed, many flaws here to be noticed which have no parallel in the wonderfully worked out first part of the drama. An author like Shakespeare, however, who seems, generally speaking, to have been constitutionally averse to altering and mending what he had once written, but who at the same time never lacked the most brilliant original inspirations, must feel inclined to counter-balance them by new dramatic effects. Moreover, it was natural to try to make up for the slackening of tension which was unavoidable if the last acts did contain little more than the unrolling of the plot. Besides, was not the necessity of comic relief at this stage of the action obviously urgent?

At the same time the author on re-reading his draft probably felt the necessity of throwing more light upon his hero. This he did in the quarrel scene.

Now if some critics were right who take Hamlet to be simply an interesting example of the "typical tragic hero" it would indeed be difficult to explain why Shakespeare inserted this scene, which without promoting the action in the slightest degree shows Hamlet's behaviour as so abnormal that all present—including his friend Horatio—feel compelled to implore him to compose himself and that the queen's words "this is mere madness" must needs go without contradiction. Those, however, who are of the persuasion that Shakespeare in painting heroes like Hamlet, Othello, Lear, or Coriolanus aimed at the representation of *passion* in its different aspects¹ will find nothing extraordinary in his endeavour to complete in this way his study of melancholy, which would have been less intelligible to his public and would have lacked a characteristic trait without this addition. There was all the more *raison d'être* for an unmistakable fit of mental derangement, provoked by the

¹ Cf. Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes Slaves of Passion*, Cambridge, 1930, *passim*.

hero's inability to suffer that another man should voice a grief similar to his own, since Marston's Antonio as well as Kyd's Hieronimo had set the example for a like climax of "passion."

It may be questioned, by the way, if in making this addition he altogether escaped the danger of inconsistency that lurks in every later revision. For it seems that the stoical composure which distinguishes the Hamlet of the last phase so visibly from the excited and tortured hero of the first acts ("there's a special providence in the fall of a sparrow" v. ii. 230) was originally meant as the natural result of his strange experiences on the voyage to England (cf. "that should teach us, there's a divinity that shapes our ends," etc., v. ii. 10), which changed his outlook on life and to a certain extent made a different man of him. In this scene, on the contrary, there is little to be noticed of such quietness of mind.

However, whether Shakespeare thwarted his own original purpose or not, he surely added some interesting new touches to the portrait of the hero. At the same time he deepened the philosophical element of the play by some brilliant meditations. Some of these are very pertinently based on the aspect of the skulls that the churlish grave-digger throws so ungently before his feet. With a curious leap of thought, however, he suddenly busies himself with the remains of Alexander the Great. The conception of "the noble dust stopping a bung-hole" exerts such a fascination upon him that he dwells on it for an astonishing length of time, sets it forth in the form of a particularising syllogism ("Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth into dust," etc.) and after hunting the idea almost to death, he expresses it once more in half-trivial, half-pathetic verses ("Imperious Cæsar, dead and turn'd to clay" etc.). Now the contrast between the barrenness of the truism that Alexander's dust is transitory and the almost reverent treatment of it on the other hand, which has puzzled a great many readers, would be easier to explain if the author dealt with a quotation. This possibility, however, seems not to be out of the question. Section 24 of the sixth book of the *Meditations* of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius contains the following sentences: "Alexander Macedo, agasoque eius, mortui in idem sunt redacti. Aut enim assumpti sunt ad mentem mundi eam, qua sati sunt reliquorum animi: aut dissipati sunt in atomos, unus perinde atque alter." Here we have an idea very similar to that in *Hamlet*: the atoms of which Alexander's body consisted have been turned into the same dust as

those of his donkey-driver (in *Hamlet* they "stop a beer-barrel.")¹ Is the similarity of these utterances a mere coincidence? The possibility cannot be disputed, the less so if one consider the special interest in Alexander which Shakespeare repeatedly evinces.² Also the *Meditations* seem to have been comparatively unknown among Shakespeare's contemporaries or at least his fellow-dramatists.³ On the other hand the quotation would be a kind of counterpart to the allusion to Socrates' reflection on the nature of death in the "To be or not to be" monologue (III. i.), which seems to be based on a passage in Florio's *Montaigne*.

But be that as it may, it affects our thesis only indirectly. There remains, however, one last and not unimportant point, which needs must be mentioned in connection with it. It is a well-known fact that the length of the *Hamlet*-text is quite abnormal. In an earlier treatise I have compared the number of lines of about seventy of the most important Elizabethan plays. The result is that Shake-

¹ The parallel seems to have escaped Rowe, Johnson, Singer, Malone, Staunton, Collier, White, Delius, Dyce, Clark-Wright, Hudson, Furness, Dowden; the *Hamlet* editors Heussi, Maclachlan, Sévrette, O'Sullivan, Fritzsche, Elze, Dover Wilson.

² Especially *Henry V*, IV. vii. 11 seq., *Coriolanus*, v. iv. 22.

³ The *Meditations* of the famous Stoic were not printed until long after Guevara's *Golden Book*, the principal source for the knowledge of Marcus Aurelius in England throughout the century. They appeared—in the original Greek—edited by Xylander at Zürich 1558, with Latin translation 1568 at Basel, again 1590 at Strassburg. No English translation is known until long after Shakespeare's death. The book is not mentioned by Chapman, Ben Jonson, Spenser, Lyly, Drayton, or Nashe. Gabriel Harvey, it is true, remarks that he should not like to "carere nec Epicteto aut Antonio Imperatore Philosopho" which may, however, refer to other writings (G. C. Moore Smith, *G. H.'s Marginalia*, 1913, p. 124). How could Shakespeare have become acquainted with the sayings of this philosopher at all? Direct study is of course out of question, an indirect source, if there be any connection to be assumed, probable. Could he have been told about it? But by whom? Sonnet 78, a poem evidently addressed to his patron, says:

"In others' works thou dost but mend the style
And arts with thy sweet graces graced be.
But thou art all my art and dost advance
As high as learning my rude ignorance."

Here "art" means "letters, learning, science" (Foster, Schmidt). If this patron be the Earl of Southampton, it is worth mentioning that among the books he gave to St. John's College, Cambridge—I have to thank the Librarian of the College for this interesting piece of information—was and still is the rare Latin-Greek edition of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* of 1568, which contains the above-quoted sentences on p. 241. It is true that this collection of books is known to have been bought not before about 1615 from another protégé of Southampton's, the Reverend William Crashaw (1572-1626), but Charlotte C. Stopes (*The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton*, Cambridge, 1922, pp. 374 seq.) has already adduced plausible reasons why part of this generous gift might have hailed from the Earl's own possession, whom—by the way—Chapman once addressed as "learned Earl." However, these conjectures are dangerous ground to tread upon.

speare's *Hamlet* exceeds in extent *all other dramas* (except Ben Jonson's, whose "literary" ambition ranges him in another category) by several hundred lines.¹ Of these seventy plays none numbers more than 3,032 lines, *Hamlet* 3,942! Now although it would be foolish to try to solve the difficult problem of the excessive length of this drama solely by the hypothesis of the churchyard scene being a later insertion, it is at any rate not uninteresting that if we deduct this from the play we get a number of lines which, although still very considerable, does not exceed that of several other long dramas of Shakespeare's. For according to the reckoning of the Globe edition the churchyard scene numbers 322 lines (together with the connecting link of v. ii. 74-80: 328 lines), so that after subtracting them there would remain little more than 3,600 lines. That, however, is about the number of lines of *Richard III*, 3,598 (Chambers and Pollard: 3,619) and not much above *Troilus and Cressida's* 3,494 (Chambers, 3,496) lines.

¹ Zum Problem der Überlieferung des *Hamlet-Textes*, Verhandlungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 6 seq. Compare also Alfred Hart, *R.E.S.*, viii., 1932, pp. 19 seq. "The Number of Lines in Shakespeare's Plays." If the above numbers were to be rectified by Hart's statements, the change of the proportions would be insignificant.

WA

DOUB
autho
light
point
be ad
in the

T

PROV

prov

OR C

M^r G

and t

p. 17

amor

It gi

as th

doub

the f

had

enter

"G.

T

Geor

pagi

spur

punc

two

Barr

the

WAS GEORGE HERBERT THE AUTHOR OF *JACULA PRUDENTUM*?

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

DOUBT has been sometimes expressed concerning George Herbert's authorship of *Jacula Prudentum*. A manuscript has now come to light which may be regarded as providing some evidence on the point, but before an account of its contents is given, it will perhaps be advisable to summarize the arguments which have been advanced in the discussion.

The first edition appeared in 1640 with the title "*OVTLANDISH PROVERBS, SELECTED By M^r. G. H.,*" and quotes 1,004 proverbs.¹ The second, bearing the title "*JACULA PRUDENTUM OR Outlandish PROVERBS, SENTENCES, &c. SELECTED By M^r George Herbert, Late Orator of the Universitie of CAMBRIDG*" and the date 1651, contains seventy pages and is then followed after p. 171, the pagination being faulty, by a number of other works, among which are "The Author's Prayers before and after Sermon." It gives 178 additional proverbs. *Jacula Prudentum* was accepted as the work of George Herbert until 1857, when J. Yeowell cast doubt upon his authorship.² He pointed out that in the copy of the first edition at the Bodleian Library the words "By M^r. G. H." had been obliterated and that the compilers of the catalogue had entered the book under "Proverbia" and not under the initials "G. H."

The latter, he appeared to suggest, might represent either George Hakewill or George Hughes. He maintained that the pagination of the second edition suspiciously resembled that of a spurious publication and considered that George Herbert, so punctiliously observant of canonical rule, would not be likely to use two unauthorized prayers in divine service, which, moreover, Barnabas Oley did not include in his various editions of *A Priest to the Temple*, or *The Country Parson*. Finally, he drew attention to

¹ Nominally there are 1,010, but the numbering is faulty.

² *Notes and Queries*, 2nd Series, No. 57, January 31, 1857, pp. 88-89.

the fact that *Jacula Prudentum* is nowhere mentioned by Oley or Izaak Walton in their lives of Herbert, and that Walton does not quote from it on any occasion. A later scholar, Peter Peckard, in his *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Nicholas Ferrar*,¹ had also omitted *Jacula Prudentum* from his list of Herbert's works. Yeowell was aware, however, that among the books and manuscripts belonging to Ferrar's godson, John Mapletoft, was "a large book of stories, with outlandish proverbs at the end, englished by Mr. Geo. Herbert: in all, 463 proverbs."² But he maintained that these proverbs might have been taken from the printed book.

These arguments were rebutted by J. E. B. Mayor.³ He asserted (a) that the greater number of proverbs in the second edition may be accounted for by the fact that manuscript copies of the book circulated and that the owners of such copies added any proverbs which they might come across, (b) that irregular pagination is common in books of the period, (c) that the "Prayers before and after Sermon" were perhaps intended for private use and, if not, there was no proof that Herbert would scruple to use prayers of his own composition; in any case, these prayers are entirely in his manner, and (d) that neither Oley, Walton, nor Peckard claims to give a complete list of Herbert's works.

In his edition of Herbert, Grosart also discussed the problem.⁴ With reference to the fact that the early editors do not mention *Jacula Prudentum*, he pointed out that Walton similarly passed over Herbert's translation of the *Treatise of Temperance and Sobriety* by Cornarus and the notes on Valdesso's *Considerations*, probably as being too slight for specific mention, and, he contended, Archdeacon Oley might have regarded this collection of proverbs as *infra dignitatem*. If either had known it to be unauthentic, he would have disowned it, especially as Oley's edition of *A Priest to the Temple* in 1652 was bound up with the 1651 edition of *Jacula Prudentum* to form one volume. This last contention seems all the more likely, because T. Garthwait, who published both these works, was the chosen friend of Oley. Grosart also drew attention to the use of the phrase "outlandish proverb" in *A Priest to the Temple*, and claimed that "Herbert's favourite and peculiar and peculiarly used

¹ Cambridge, 1790.

² In the Middle Hill MS. 9527. See J. E. B. Mayor, *Cambridge in the Seventeenth Century*, Part 1, Nicholas Ferrar, Cambridge, 1855, Appendix, p. 302.

³ *Notes and Queries*, 2nd Series, No. 59, February 14, 1857, p. 130.

⁴ *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of George Herbert*, London, 1874, vol. iii, pp. 313-14.

words and turns" can be observed in the proverbs, "so as to place their genuineness as his collection and largely his own composition beyond doubt."

A more recent editor, Professor G. H. Palmer,¹ emphasizes Herbert's love of condensation, his skill in achieving compactness being notable, and rightly says that it is precisely this love of pithy statement which accounts for his compiling such a collection of proverbs as *Jacula Prudentum*. But the work is excluded from this edition, on the ground that "nothing is his in the *Jacula Prudentum* except the collection, and at least two thirds of that is the work of later editors."²

Before this opinion is scrutinized, it will be appropriate to give an account of MS 5301 E at the National Library of Wales. It was at one time in the possession of the Herbert family and belongs to the collection of which the origin has already been traced in the *Modern Language Review*.³ The heading, which displays a notable similarity to the title of the first edition of *Jacula Prudentum*, runs thus: "Outlandishe Prouerbs selected out of seuerall Languages & entered here the vi. August 1637 At Ribsford." After this comes the signature "H H," the two letters interlaced, which clearly stands for Henry Herbert. Then follows a list of proverbs, also in the hand of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels. They are reproduced below, with the addition, for convenience' sake, of numbers which the manuscript lacks throughout:

1. Man purposethe God Disposethe.
2. He begins to Dye that quits his Desires.
3. An Handfull of Good Life Is better then a bushell of Learninge.
4. He that studies his content wantes It.
5. Euery Day brings Its bread with It.
6. Humble hearts haue humble Desires.
7. He that stumbles & fals not mends his pace.
8. The House shews the Owner.
9. He that gets out of Debt growes riche.
10. All Is well with him that Is loued of his neighbors.
11. Buildinge & marryinge of children are great wasters.
12. A good bargaine Is a Pickpurse.
13. The scalded Dog feares cold water.
14. Pleasinge ware Is halfe sould.
15. Light burdens longe boren are heauy.

¹ *The English Works of George Herbert*, Boston and New York, 1907. vol. i, pp. 156-57.

² *Ibid.*, vol. i, Preface, p. xviii.

³ July, 1933, p. 295.

16. The wolfe knowes what the Ill beast thinkes.
17. Who hath none to still him may weepe out his eyes.
18. When all sins growe Old, couetousnes grows yonge.
19. If you would knowe a Knaue giue him a staffe.
20. You cannot Knowe wine by the barell.
21. A coole mouthe & warme feete liue longe.
22. An Horse made & a man to make.
23. Looke not for Muske In a Dogs Kennell.
24. Not a longe Day but a Good heart ryds worke.
25. He puls with a longe rope that waytes for anothers Deathe.
26. Great stroakes make not sweet musicke.
27. A Cake and an Ill custome must bee broken.
28. A fatt Housekeeper makes a leane Executor.
29. Empty chambers make foolishe maydes.
30. The Gentle Hawke halfe mans herselfe.
31. The Deuill Is not always at one Doore.
32. When a frend askes ther Is no Toomorrowe.
33. God sends cold accordinge to clothes.
34. One sounde blowe will serue to vndoe all.
35. He loosethe nothinge that looseth not God.
36. The Germans witt lies In his fingers.
37. At Dinner my man appeares.
38. Who giues to all Denyes to all.
39. Quick beleeuers need broad shoulders.
40. Who remoue stones bruise their fingers.
41. All came from & will goe to others.
42. He that will take the birde must not skare It.
43. He liues vnsafely that lookes too near on things.
44. A Gentle Huswife mars the Houshould.
45. A crooked logg makes a streyt fyer.
46. He hath great neede of a foole that playes the foole himselfe.
47. A merchant that gaines not looses.
48. Let not him that feares feathers come amongst wilde fowle.
49. Loue and a Cough cannot bee hid.
50. A Dwarfe on a Gyants shoulders sees farther then they two.
51. He that sends a foole means to followe him.
52. The longest Day hath an Eueninge.
53. Brablinge Curs neuer wante toren eares.
54. Better the feete slipp then the tongue.
55. For washinge his hands none sellethe his lands.
56. A lyons skinn Is neuer cheape.
57. The Goate must browse where she Is tyed.
58. Who hath a wolfe for his mate needs a Dog for his man.
59. In a Good house All Is quickly ready.
60. God oft hath a Great share In a litle house.
61. Ill ware Is neuer cheape.
62. Who eates the Kings Goose uoydes the feathers an hundred years after.

63. A cheerfull looke makes a Dishe a feast.
64. If all fooles had Bables wee should wante fuell.
65. Vertue neuer growes olde.
66. Eueninge words are not lyke to morninge.
67. Were ther no fooles bad ware would not pass.
68. Neuer had Ill workman good Toolles.
69. He stands not surely that neuer slipte.
70. Were ther no hearers ther would bee no backbiters.
71. Euery thinge Is of vse to a Housekeeper.
72. When prayers are Done my Lady Is ready.

On comparing this list with the opening pages of the first edition of *Jacula Prudentum*, we find that in the main they agree. Nos. 52 and 62, however, do not occur in *Jacula Prudentum* and on the other hand, this work contains as No. 59 "A bad dog never sees the wolfe," which does not appear in the manuscript. Instead of "Cake," the reading in No. 27 of the manuscript, we observe that both editions of *Jacula Prudentum* have "Caske." This is, of course, reproduced by Grosart and has also made its way into G. L. Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases*.¹ That the manuscript reading is correct may be seen from Cotgrave's *French-English Dictionary*, which was one of the chief sources of *Jacula Prudentum*. Under "Gasteau" we discover the proverb "Gasteau, & mauvaise coustume se doivent rompre" and the English equivalent: "A (good) cake, and an ill custome should be broken." Apart from these divergences there are but slight differences between the manuscript and the printed version.

Thus the existence, as Mayor assumed, of manuscripts of *Jacula Prudentum* in circulation is clearly proved. It is evident that four years after George Herbert's death his brother Henry was in possession of a manuscript of these "Outlandish Proverbs" and was apparently engaged in "entering" or noting them down in his country house at Ribbesford. Whether the manuscript contained only this small number or whether Sir Henry interrupted his task it is impossible to say. However, this manuscript certainly tends to corroborate the opinion of those who have held *Jacula Prudentum* to be the authentic work of George Herbert. Moreover, it makes one wonder whether Professor Palmer is correct in asserting that only one third of *Jacula Prudentum* at most can be regarded as from George Herbert's pen. Possibly he is influenced by the fact that the Mapletoft manuscript contained only 463 proverbs, but one

¹ London, 1929, p. 83.

could with equal logic maintain that MS. 5301 E at the National Library of Wales was the original work of George Herbert and that the 391 additional proverbs in the Mapletoft manuscript were subsequently inserted by others. It would seem more likely that these manuscripts, whatever the cause of their incompleteness, do not represent the whole collection, and it is only reasonable therefore to regard the first edition of *Jacula Prudentum* as authentic. Whether the proverbs added in the second edition may not have been appended to other manuscripts by their owners and thus erroneously have crept into the printed work, as Mayor suggested, is a possibility which must be considered, though it can hardly be demonstrated.

THE

MAC
it fir
dividA
in so
singl
accu
best
artifi
to th
prec
mag
pleato s
pro
eighwo
wo
sub
I ta
con
arefar
Po
me
Sp
by
th

PE

THE RECEPTION OF JOHNSON'S PROSE STYLE

By W. VAUGHAN REYNOLDS

MACAULAY, speaking of the reception afforded to the *Rambler* when it first appeared, gives the following picture of Johnson's critics, divided into opposite camps :

A large party pronounced the style perfect, so absolutely perfect that in some essays it would be impossible for the writer himself to alter a single word for the better. Another party, not less numerous, vehemently accused him of having corrupted the purity of the English tongue. The best critics admitted that his diction was too monotonous, too obviously artificial, and now and then turgid even to absurdity. But they did justice to the acuteness of his observations on morals and manners, to the constant precision and frequent brilliancy of his language, to the weighty and magnificent eloquence of many serious passages, and the solemn yet pleasing humour of some of the lighter passages.¹

So have his critics always remained. This article is an attempt to show the various opinions of the contending parties on Johnson's prose style, the discussion being almost wholly confined to the eighteenth century.

What Macaulay said of the *Rambler* was true of most of Johnson's work. His reputation as man of letters once established, fresh works from his pen aroused controversy—now on account of their subject, now on account of their style or of the sentiments expressed. I take Johnson's detractors first, as they include those whom Macaulay considers "the best critics." Their name was legion, but only a few are remembered to-day.

The *Dictionary* may fairly be said to have established Johnson's fame. His previous works, even the satire *London*, which delighted Pope, even *The Vanity of Human Wishes* with its fine command of metre, even *The Rambler*, held by some to be the superior of *The Spectator*, failed to arouse an interest comparable with that excited by this triumph of single-handed lexicography. Appropriately, then, the first paper mentioned concerns the *Dictionary*, and its

¹ Article on Samuel Johnson, *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed., vol. xv, pp. 466, col. ii—467, col. i).

effect on Johnson's style. Although actually entitled *A Defence of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Dr. Johnson's Shakespeare*,¹ it pays attention to the style of the *Ramblers*, and treats the faults of those essays at some length. The reviewer pierces the weak point in Johnson's armour by mentioning the "amazing number of blunders and inconsistencies in etymology" to be found in the *Dictionary*, which had been "recommended by foreigners as a standard of the English language." The mistakes of the lexicographer led him to examine the compositions of the writer. In these he discovered

the same traces of inattention to the idiom of our tongue. . . . In the meantime he [Johnson] was found to be eternally aiming at the introduction of *Latinisms*, and other vicious modes of expression, by way of *enriching* our tongue; but thereby corrupting it, as he himself says of Shakespeare, "by almost every mode of depravation."

Proceeding further, the reviewer finds that Johnson

instead of producing great and noble images . . . seldom reached farther than high sounding words. Instead of new and really elegant turns of thought, his novelty and refinement generally ended in some florid allusion, quaint antithesis, or fanatical preciseness of expression. His verse seemed heavy, cold and spiritless; and his prose alternately pompous and puerile.²

The accusation implied above, that Johnson's ignorance of native etymology and idiom drove him on to the surer ground of Latinisms, finds the support of Archibald Campbell in *Lexiphanes*. The title page announces that the dialogue is

An attempt to restore the ENGLISH Tongue to its ancient Purity, and to correct, as well as expose, the affected Style, hard Words and absurd Phraseology of many late Writers, and particularly of our ENGLISH LEXIPHANES, the RAMBLER.

Campbell attacks Johnson through parody, but his imitation is unsuccessful. He represents Johnson's style as consisting of a mass of polysyllables and triplets, mostly tautological. His parody is

¹ Published in London in 1766. On the title page, the author is named as "A friend. R.R." It was probably by Kenrick, who sought to conceal his responsibility by using these initials. He had published in 1765 *A Review of Dr. Johnson's new edition of Shakespeare* under his own name. This had been examined by James Barclay, in a paper called an *Examination of Mr. Kenrick's Review* (1766). The reply soon appeared, and if, as is generally supposed, it came from Kenrick's pen, he did not wish to admit that he had been so far stung as to answer in print.

² The quotations included in the text are from pp. 6-8 of the 1766 issue of this *Defence*.

manifestly unfair, and we should not expect this volume to contain much useful criticism. After the implications of the title-page, that Johnson had contaminated the English tongue; that his words were hard, his phraseology absurd, and his style affected; *Lexiphanes* has little material which calls for remark. Campbell suggests that the influence of Johnson's work for the *Dictionary* on the style of the *Ramblers* had its financial, as well as its literary aspects. "Twere to be wished we could only recover him so far as to enable him to translate his own *Ramblers* into tolerable good English; such English, I mean, as a common reader might understand, without the help of a dictionary. For after all, this may be a bookseller's project at bottom; he might write his *Ramblers* to make his dictionary necessary, and afterwards compile his dictionary to explain his *Ramblers*." ¹

Another imitator of Johnson, George Colman, undertook the twofold task of parodist and critic. In his *Prose on Several Occasions* ² appears *A Sketch of Dr. Johnson*, signed "Chiaro Oscuro," and dated December 22, 1775. Campbell's criticism had been unreasoned and ill-founded; Colman, on the other hand, in moderate terms, points to an obvious weakness in Johnson's more imaginative papers:

In his *Ramblers* and *Idlers*, whenever he introduces characters, their actions, deportment and thoughts have a most accurate and minute resemblance to nature, but they all talk one language, and that language is Dr. Johnson's. Words are the vehicle of our thoughts, as coaches are of our persons; the *state-equipage* should not be drawn forth but upon solemn occasions. ³

Johnson was lashed by Churchill in the third part of *The Ghost*. ⁴ The satirist disliked Johnson primarily for his Tory politics, but he tilts at his literary reputation in three passages. One of these brought home to Johnson the necessity of producing his edition of Shakespeare, the proposals for which had been printed seventeen years before. The other two refer to his style, and are much in the spirit of Campbell. When the "Ghost," commanded to knock nine times, obeyed

Immane Pomposo ⁵ was not heard
T' import one crabbed foreign word:
Fear seizes heroes, fools and wits,
And Plausible his prayers forgets. ⁶

¹ *Lexiphanes*, 4th ed., pp. 108-9.

² Published 1787.

³ *Prose on Several Occasions*, 1787, vol. ii, pp. 98-9.

⁴ Issued 1762.

⁵ Johnson.

⁶ *The Ghost*, ii, 335-38.

The account of those "singled forth" to test the authenticity of the "Ghost," gives the following picture of Johnson as a literary dictator :

Pomposo,—insolent and loud,
Vain idol of a scribbling crowd,
Whose very name inspires an awe,
Whose every word is sense and law ;
For what his greatness hath decreed,
Like laws of Persia and of Mede,
Sacred through all the realm of Wit,
Must never of repeal admit ;
Who, cursing flattery, is the tool
Of every fawning, flattering fool ;
Who Wit with jealous eye surveys,
And sickens at another's praise ;
Who, proudly seized of learning's throne,
Now damns all learning but his own ;
Who scorns those common wares to trade in,
Reasoning, convincing, and persuading,
But makes each sentence current pass
With puppy, coxcomb, scoundrel, ass ;
For 'tis with him a certain rule,
The folly's proved when he calls fool ;
Who to increase his native strength,
Draws words six syllables in length,
With which, assisted with a frown,
By way of club, he knocks us down ;
Who 'bove the vulgar dares to rise,
And sense of decency defies ;
For this same decency is made
Only for bunglers in the trade,
And, like the cobweb laws, is still
Broke through by great ones when they will—
Pomposo, with strong sense supplied,
Supported, and confirm'd by Pride,
His comrade's terrors to beguile
"Grinn'd horribly a ghastly smile :"
Features so horrid, were it light,
Would put the devil himself to flight.¹

By 1780, the *Lives of the Poets* were making their appearance. Johnson's critical opinions did not meet with universal approval. Papers were issued by champions of Milton and Gray, who thought the Doctor ill-qualified to judge the merit of their favourites. Indignation at his critical dicta often prompted attacks on his style. A paper entitled *Remarks on Johnson's life of Milton*² speaks of Johnson's "inimitable style of abuse."³ This remark only leads up to a more general censure of his manner :

¹ *The Ghost*, ii, 653-88.

² "To which are added Milton's Tractate of Education and Areopagitica," London, 1780. [By Archdeacon Francis Blackburne.]

³ P. 99.

We should perhaps be degraded into the class of such cavillers,¹ should we express our dislike of Dr. Johnson's style; but candor itself must allow, that there are periods in it which require to be translated into intelligible English, even where the sentiment is trivial enough for the conception of an honest John Trot.²

Johnson's strictures on Gray called forth this abuse from John Callander:³

It is curious to observe a man draw his own picture, without intending it. Pomposo, when censuring some of his odes, observes, that "Gray is too fond of words arbitrarily compounded. The mind of the writer seems to work with unnatural violence. *Double, double, toil and trouble.*" He (the author of an *Elegy in a country church-yard*) "has a kind of strutting dignity, and is tall by walking on tip-toe. His art and his struggle are too visible, and there is too little appearance of ease, or nature. In all Gray's odes, there is a kind of cumbrous splendour which we wish away." We may say like Nathan, *Thou art the man.*⁴

Writing of Johnson's *Life of Milton*, Callander remarks:

With all his affectation of hard words, the Doctor becomes at once intelligible when he wishes to reprobate a rival genius, or insult the ashes of a benefactor. In defiance of Addison, and a thousand other *shallow fellows*, he asserts that Milton "both in prose and verse had formed his stile by a *perverse and pedantick principle.*"⁵

Three years after Johnson's death the Reverend Robert Burrowes, A.M., published an *Essay on the Stile of Dr. Samuel Johnson*.⁶ This is an important fact in Johnson criticism; his style is now being carefully weighed and valued, without the bias of either party or faction. The results of the inquiry are unfavourable, but the essay shows a commendable resolution to avoid groundless assertions and to base all critical comments on definite inquiry.

Burrowes finds Johnson's style obscure, mainly from his affectation

¹ I.e. Carping critics like Johnson.

² P. 129.

³ In *Deformities of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, selected from his works. 1st ed., Edinburgh, 1782; and ed., London, 1782. [By John Callander of Craigforth.]

⁴ 1st ed., p. 17.

⁵ 2nd ed., p. 44. The reference to Milton does not occur in the first edition, where the word *benefactor* is followed by the sentence: "Speaking of Mr. Walmsley he says, 'In this man's house I passed many cheerful and agreeable hours.' But 'he (Mr. Walmsley) was a *whig*, with all the *virulence* and *malevolence* of his party.'"

⁶ This appeared in Volume I of the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* for the year 1787, published at Dublin. Vol. I is divided into two sections—Science and Polite Literature. The Essay, which is in two parts, begins on p. 27 of the section devoted to Polite Literature.

of polysyllables of Latin origin. Johnson thus defeats his own ends. As a moralist, his aim is to instruct the people; but he gives his salutary counsel in words beyond the comprehension of ordinary men.¹ Burrowes admits, however, that Johnson's long words are "formed according to the exact analogy of the English language"²—which is at least an important concession.

Johnson's faults of style are placed under two heads—"as arising either from his endeavours after splendor and magnificence, or from his endeavours after harmony."³ His attempts to attain sublimity "taught him the abundant use of inversions and licentious constructions of every sort. Almost all his sentences begin with an oblique case, and words used in uncommon significations, with Latin and Greek idioms, are strewed too plentifully in his pages."⁴ The principal error resulting from Johnson's study of harmony is called by Burrowes "the parallelism of his sentences," that is, his balance. Of this "fault," the critic remarks: "There is scarcely a page of the *Rambler* which does not produce abundant instances of this peculiarity: and what is the ornament, which if introduced so often, can be always introduced happily?"⁵ In these extracts, Burrowes was not in his happiest mood. Johnson *opposed* Latin and Greek idioms: his use of inversions is not "abundant,"⁶ and his balance is not employed so frequently as to become an affectation.

A generous appreciation of Johnson's talent for antithetical composition follows this censure of his balance. "For antithesis indeed he was most eminently qualified; none has exceeded him in nicety of discernment, and no author's vocabulary has ever equalled his in a copious assortment of forcible and definite expressions."⁷ This is discounted somewhat by strictures on his carelessness of arrangement and his faulty harmonies. "... Sounds almost similar are suffered to approach too near each other; and though some of these are too palpable to be passed over unnoticed by the author, yet I can never think any ear so incorrect as to adopt sameness and monotony for harmony."⁸

But though Burrowes has produced a telling criticism, his name is not generally familiar to readers of the present day. The most

¹ P. 28.⁴ Pp. 47-48.³ P. 40.⁵ P. 50.³ P. 43.

⁶ In the first ten *Ramblers* I can find only seventeen inverted constructions—not an inordinately large number in sixty-five pages of the 1792 edition of his *Works*. Johnson's critics seem to have paid too much attention to his inversions.

⁷ Pp. 51-52.⁸ P. 54.

famous name among Johnson's contemporary detractors is that of Horace Walpole. This master of the gentlest art rarely suppressed his feelings; not the least remarkable of which was a peevish dislike of Johnson—both as a man and a literary figure. Ten letters,¹ ranging over a period of nine and a half years, bear witness to Walpole's contempt of the prose which was still rousing controversy through the country. "I have no thirst to know the rest of my contemporaries," he writes in 1773, "from the absurd bombast of Dr. Johnson down to the silly Dr. Goldsmith, though the latter changeling has had bright gleams of parts, and the former had sense, till he changed it for words, and sold it for a pension."² In an epistle to the Reverend William Mason,³ Johnson's sense is described as "overwhelmed by words." A third letter⁴ refers to "the fustian of his style, and the meanness of his spirit," which are good enough to please the degenerate age.

Walpole occasionally criticises individual works of Johnson, as apart from the general style in which his writings are couched. Of the *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, he remarks: "What a heap of words to express very little! and though it is the least cumbersome of any style he ever used, how far from easy and natural!"⁵ By such letters we are introduced into the libraries of men of fashion, and look over their shoulders as they read each new production of Johnson's pen. His diction is condemned as "teeth-breaking" in one letter,⁶ and as "composed of the limbs of clowns of different nations" in another.⁷ Johnson's use of the triplet is described by Walpole as "triple tautology, or the fault of repeating the same sense in three different phrases."⁸ The *Life of Pope* is "a most trumpery performance, and stuffed with all his crabbed phrases and vulgarisms. . . . He seems to have read the ancients with no view but of pilfering polysyllables, utterly insensible to the graces of their simplicity, and these are called standards of biography!"⁹ Johnson's character of Warburton, in his *Life of Addison*, is "expressed

¹ References in the following notes are to the numbering and pagination of Mrs. Paget Toynbee's sixteen volume Oxford edition of *The Letters of Horace Walpole, fourth Earl of Orford*, 1904.

² Letter 1461, April 27, 1773.—viii, 269.

³ Letter 1535, April 7, 1774.—viii, 440.

⁴ Letter 1554, August 23, 1774.—ix, 35.

⁵ Letter 1600, January 21, 1775.—ix, 146.

⁶ Letter 1612, April 3, 1775.—ix, 173.

⁷ Letter 1682, February 18, 1776.—ix, 329.

⁸ Letter 1922, February 1, 1779.—x, 372.

⁹ Letter 2165, April 14, 1781.—xi, 427-28.

in the same uncouth phrases which he satirizes,"¹ and Madame d'Arblay's *Cecilia* is censured for being written in Dr. Johnson's "unnatural phrase." This was in 1782,² and thus a period of nearly ten years had not diminished Walpole's dislike of the Johnsonian style.

The points amassed against Johnson's style by his critics can be restated in the form of a threefold charge. His love of Latinisms and hard words forced him into a pompous, obscure and affected style; his attempts to attain the sublime introduced licentious constructions into his work; and in seeking rhythm he had only achieved monotonous parallelisms and disjointed harmonies. These were serious objections; but Johnson's army of admirers was as numerous as that of his foes.³

The first adulatory passage which we have to consider came, strangely enough, from the pen of an opponent. Johnson's *Taxation No Tyranny*, perhaps the least fortunate of his political pamphlets, met with stern opposition. One of the papers written in reply appeared under the flatly contradictory title of *Taxation, Tyranny*.⁴ While attacking Johnson's opinions, it pays tribute to his mastery of the art of prose, and gives evidence of the contemporary recognition of that mastery:

I recollect the time when entertainment and instruction were inseparably connected with every sentence which you wrote. Amidst the splendour of your language, we traced the close solidity of argument. To what cause, whilst you remain fantastically nice in the attainments of the former, must we attribute your contemptuous desertion of the latter? The sounds of reason are no more; the harmony of the periods still ravishes the ear, and reminds us of the music of an Opera, accompanying words the meaning of which is neither recommended by its novelty, nor distinguished by its importance.⁵

"The death of Dr. Johnson," says Murphy, "kept the public mind in agitation beyond all former example. No literary character

¹ Letter 2215, September 25, 1781.—xii, 58.

² Letter 2357, October 1, 1782.—xii, 339.

³ Included among his foes, but rather outside the main current of contemporary criticism was Dr. M. Maty, who reviewed English productions in French. His review of Johnson's *Dictionary*, in the *Journal Britannique* contains these remarks: "Son stile est pur, fort, et majestueux; mais il abonde en figures, et en antithèses, on y trouve souvent de l'enflure, et presque toujours une affectation de symétrie, de cadence, et d'obscurité.—Vol. xvii (July-August, 1755), p. 223.

⁴ *Taxation, Tyranny*. Addressed to Samuel Johnson, LL.D., London, 1775. Published anonymously.

⁵ Pp. 1-2.

ever excited so much attention."¹ It is, then, not surprising that a number of biographical sketches, now paling into insignificance beside Boswell, but yet valuable in themselves, appeared in rapid succession within a few years of the end of his life. The first three of these, *A Biographical Sketch of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, (1784) by Thomas Tyers, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (1785), published by Kearsley and attributed to William Cook, and *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Dr. Samuel Johnson*, (1785) commonly said to be by the Reverend William Shaw, are not important for our purpose. Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes of the late Samuel Johnson, LL.D., during the last twenty years of his life* one might expect to prove more fruitful, but it contains only a few meagre references to Johnson's conversational style. These remarks deserve attention, however, as they show how Mrs. Piozzi realized the greatness of the thought behind the long words :

His mind was so comprehensive, that no language but that he used could have expressed its contents ; and so ponderous was his language, that sentiments less lofty and less solid than his were, would have been encumbered, not adorned by it.

Mr. Johnson was not intentionally, however, a pompous converser ; and though he was accused of using big words, as they are called, it was only when little ones would not express his meaning as clearly, or when, perhaps, the elevation of the thought would have been disgraced by a dress less superb.²

Four notable biographies contain definite attempts to describe the nature of Johnson's style, to trace its development and estimate its value. Joseph Towers, LL.D. produced his *Essay on the Life, Character and Writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson* in 1786. He remarks upon the "harmony and splendour of the language" in the *Ramblers*,³ and upon the "admirable language and highly polished periods" of the "political productions."⁴ The *Lives of the Poets* "abound with . . . beauties of style."⁵ Summing up, Towers points out that Johnson's manner suited his thought. Though seemingly too learned for common readers, it appealed to those whom Johnson had chosen as his public. Whatever its faults, his style had "great strength and great dignity" and its periods were "often highly polished"; perhaps the task of finding a contemporary who wrote the English language with equal energy would be difficult.⁶

¹ *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.—Works of Johnson* (1792 ed.), i, 3-4.

² 1st ed., p. 33.

³ P. 45.

⁴ 1st ed., p. 298.

⁵ P. 102.

⁶ Pp. 114-17.

Next to appear was the *Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, by Sir John Hawkins, knight.¹ The biographer's first praise of Johnson's style is implied rather than definitely expressed. He declares that the mistakes and grammatical licentiousness of the translation of the *Voyage to Abyssinia* make it very hard to believe that Johnson was responsible.² Passing on to the *Rambler*, Hawkins remarks that the style was original, though said by some to be tumid. But "the vulgar opinion," he adds, "is that the style of this century is the perfection of our language, and that we owe its ultimate and final improvement to Mr. Addison, and when we make his cold and languid periods the test, it is no wonder if we mistake strength and animation for tumidity."³

Johnson's "excellence as a writer" is ascribed to the influence of "the divines and others of the last century" on his vocabulary and constructions.⁴ His style was the model on which popular English orators then living founded their speeches. This was proof of Johnson's "purity, elegance and strength."⁵ The style of *Rasselas* earns high praise: "Considered as a specimen of our language, it is scarcely to be paralleled: it is written in a style refined to a degree of immaculate purity, and displays the whole force of turgid eloquence."⁶ Gleig, in his general preface to his edition of Johnson's translation of *A Voyage to Abyssinia* (London, 1789) attacks Sir John Hawkins as unsuited to the task of editing Johnson's works, and acting as his biographer and critic, mentioning his taste as "deplorable"⁷; however that may be, Hawkins was an enthusiastic defender of Johnson's style.

Arthur Murphy was an important predecessor of Boswell. His *Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson* was prefixed to the 1792 edition of Johnson's *Works*, and published separately in 1793. After describing a passage from the translation of Lobo's *Voyage* as the performance of an infant Hercules,⁸ the biographer makes little reference to style for nearly one hundred and fifty pages. When he returns to the discussion it is to consider two well-worn questions—the effect of the *Dictionary* on the style of *The Rambler*, and Johnson's debt to Sir Thomas Browne and the prose-writers of the preceding century. Murphy has nothing new to say:

It is remarkable, that the pomp of diction, which has been objected

¹ London, 1787.

⁴ P. 271.

⁷ P. 1.

² 1st ed., pp. 22-23.

⁵ P. 291.

⁸ 1793 ed., p. 15.

³ Pp. 269-70.

⁶ P. 367.

to Johnson was first assumed in the *Rambler*. His Dictionary was going on at the same time, and, in the course of that work, as he grew familiar with the technical and scholastic words, he thought that the bulk of his readers were equally learned or at least would admire the splendour and dignity of the style.

But how Johnson came to differ so widely from such "elegant models" as Cowley, Dryden, Tillotson, Temple, Addison, Swift and Pope is a problem

not to be solved unless it be true that he took an early tincture from the writers of the last century, particularly Sir Thomas Browne. Hence the peculiarities of the style, new combinations, sentences of an unusual structure, and words derived from the learned languages. . . . There is, it must be admitted, a swell of language often out of all proportion to the sentiment; but there is, in general, a fulness of mind, and the thought seems to expand with the sound of the words. Determined to discard colloquial barbarisms and licentious idioms, he forgot the elegant simplicity that distinguishes the writings of Addison.¹

If this paragraph leaves an unfavourable impression behind, Murphy pays an eloquent tribute to Johnson's command of style three pages later: ²

Johnson is JUPITER TONANS: he darts his lightning, and rolls his thunder, in the cause of virtue and piety. The language seems to fall short of his ideas; he pours along, familiarizing the times [*sic*] of philosophy, with bold inversions, and sonorous periods; but we may apply to him what Pope has said of Homer: "It is the sentiment that swells and fills out the diction, which rises with it, and forms itself about it; like glass in the furnace, which grows to greater magnitude, as the breath within is more powerful, and the heat more intense."

After this, Murphy must be classed among Johnson enthusiasts.

The appearance of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*³ did not stop the flow of biographies. *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D., with Critical Observations on his Works*, by Robert Anderson, M.D., was published in London in 1795. The criticism of Johnson's style, concentrated in a few pages, contains some interesting remarks. Although there is some tendency to pomposity in his diction, Johnson's epistolary skill entitles him to rank with the best letter-writers of the nation.⁴ This division of his literary productions is

¹ Pp. 156-58.

² P. 161.

³ Boswell's opinion of Johnson's style is so well known, and the volumes containing it are so easily accessible that it is not included here. It is summarized most clearly in the passage I, 217-225 (Birkbeck Hill ed.).

⁴ 1st ed., pp. 217-18.

too rarely discussed by his critics. Anderson admits that Johnson's adoption of Latin derivatives marks an innovation, but this would not be dangerous if he were copied only by men capable of thinking with equal precision. Johnson's "comprehension of mind was the mould for his language. Had this comprehension been narrower, his expression would have been easier . . ." ¹ "And it is to be remembered," proceeds Anderson, "that while he has added harmony and dignity to our language, he has neither vitiated it by the insertion of foreign idioms, or the affectation of anomaly in the construction of his sentences." ²

Literary biographers often make chronological surveys of their author's style. Anderson's views are peculiar, and unlike Boswell, ³ he finds little trace of Johnson's settled "manner" in his early performances. He also remarks that Johnson "altered, and perhaps improved his style, "long after his reputation had been established, and his *Rambler* had appeared. The composition of this work differs a good deal from that of *Rasselas*, *The Journey to the Western Islands*, and *The Lives of the Poets*. Anderson agrees with the usual theory, that the seventeenth century prose-writers had helped to mould the style of the *Rambler* essays. ⁴ The biographer concludes by noting Johnson's effect on his contemporaries: ". . . from the influence which he has had upon our composition, scarcely anything is written now, that is not better expressed than was usual before he appeared to lead the national taste." ⁵

Our excursions into the nineteenth century must be strictly limited. Three critics alone are considered. In 1802 *A Critical Enquiry into the Moral Writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson* was published in London, the author's name being given as Attalus. ⁶ This production is interesting as evidence of the continued inquiry into the nature and value of Johnson's work. Though the author possesses no very pronounced critical ability, he draws a notable comparison between Addison and Johnson, which shows that they were still regarded as rival claimants of the palm among essayists:

Johnson possessed powers unattainable by Addison; and Addison moved in a circle where Johnson could not approach. Addison is gay and lively; Johnson grave and sententious. Addison is sometimes trifling; Johnson is always uniform. Addison is seldom more than

¹ Pp. 227-28.

² P. 228.

³ *Life*, i, 88.

⁴ Pp. 229-31.

⁵ Pp. 231-32.

⁶ The 1803 edition bears the name of William Mudford, the pseudonym being dropped.

pleasing; Johnson is of the sublime; the language of Addison is pure and simple; that of Johnson is nervous and elegant; Addison's is equable, and never offends by its harshness; Johnson's is sometimes rugged and pedantic; Addison is never affecting; Johnson is often highly pathetic; Addison displays no irregular flights, no sudden inspirations; Johnson rises with his subject and frequently towers into sublimity. . . .¹

Attalus considers the style of *Rasselas* dignified and "uniformly grand," but has to admit that there is a "want of discrimination" between the characters.²

Alexander Chalmers is concerned more closely with the essays than with Johnson's other works. His reviews of the *Rambler* and the *Idler* in *The British Essayists*, first published in 1802,³ take the form of "historical and biographical prefaces," and he does his work thoroughly and well. The most important point in Chalmers's survey is his investigation of Johnson's revisions, but he also has some remarks on the style of both the *Rambler* and the *Idler*. On the reception of the *Rambler*, he makes the same observation as most critics: "The style was new: it appeared harsh, involved, and perplexed: it required more than a transitory inspection to be understood; it did not suit those who run as they read, and who seldom return to a book if the hour which it helped to dissipate can be dissipated by more active pleasures."⁴ But, as Chalmers remarks at a later stage in his preface,⁵ "the prejudices which were alarmed by a new style and manner have long subsided"; and though a new generation of detractors has arisen, incessantly repeating the "few . . . pedantic sentences" of the *Rambler*, these objections are, fortunately, "not very prevalent." The general opinion is, "that although Dr. Johnson is not to be imitated with perfect success, yet the attempt to imitate him, where it has neither been servile nor artificial, has elevated the style of every species of literary composition. In everything, we perceive more vigour, more spirit, more elegance. He not only began a revolution in our language, but lived till it was almost completed."⁶

Chalmers disagrees with Anderson, finding Johnson's settled "manner" even in his earliest works. Comparing the styles of Addison and Johnson, he gives preference to the former, on the

¹ 1802 ed., pp. 61-2.

² P. 82.

³ The references are to the 1823 ed. of *The British Essayists, with Prefaces Historical and Bibliographical*, London. Vols. xvi, xvii and xviii contain the *Rambler*, and Vol. xxvii the *Idler*.

⁴ Vol. xvi, p. xix.

⁵ P. xl.

⁶ Pp. xl-xli.

ground of his *more general utility*, Johnson's style being only calculated for the more liberally educated readers of the eighteenth century. Both, however, wrote in their natural manner. "The earliest of Dr. Johnson's works confirm this; from the moment he could write at all, he wrote in stately periods; and his conversation, from first to last, abounded in the peculiarities of his composition."¹ One of the chief merits of Chalmers as a critic of Johnson was that he realized the close connection between the Doctor's style and his theme. He tries to explain the lighter style of the *Lives of the Poets* as the result of subject matter:

If the *Lives of the Poets* be thought an exception to Dr. Johnson's general habit of writing, let it be remembered that he was for the most part confined to dates and facts, to illustrations and criticisms, and questions; but when he indulged himself in moral reflections, to which he delighted to recur, we have again the vigour and loftiness of the *Rambler*, and only miss some of what have been termed his *hard words*.²

On the *Idler*, the critic has less to say. "These Essays . . . afford evident marks of the same depth of thought which predominates in the *Rambler*, although expressed with more ease and familiarity of style and more general gaiety of manner."³ Chalmers had remarked how Johnson, in the *Rambler*, had given all his correspondents the same lofty periods⁴; in the *Idler*, however, the characteristic correspondence is more fortunate, as "the Author unbends with considerable felicity . . . and where he catches himself relapsing into his more solemn periods, he immediately descends to common language. . . ."⁵

Chalmers had written historical and biographical prefaces. Nathan Drake, the last critic we shall consider, produced a series of *Essays, Biographical, Critical and Historical* illustrative of the various series of collected papers, such as the *Spectator* and the *Rambler*. His essays "illustrative of the *Tatler*, *Spectator* and *Guardian*" appeared in three volumes in 1805. The paper *On the Progress and Merits of English Style, and on the Style of Addison in particular* contains a reference to the influence of Johnson's "splendid and elaborate diction" on literary expression.⁶ The subject of Johnson's style is exhaustively treated in the series on the *Rambler*, *Adventurer* and *Idler*, produced by Drake in 1809.⁷

¹ P. xlii.² *Ibid.*³ Vol. xxvii, pp. x-xi.⁴ Vol. xvi, p. xliii.⁵ Vol. xxvii, p. xi.⁶ Vol. ii, p. 114.⁷ *Essays, Biographical, Critical and Historical*, illustrative of the *Rambler*, *Adventurer* and *Idler*, and of the various periodical papers which, in imitation of

The author finds traces of Johnson's settled style in *The Preface to the Translation of Father Lobo's Voyage*, but it was not until the *Rambler* appeared that Johnson "first presented to the public those peculiarities and prominent beauties of style which immediately distinguished him, in so striking a manner, from all preceding writers, and which have made so durable an impression upon our language."¹

In twelve pages,² Drake gives an excellent survey of Johnson's style. He does not give unqualified praise; he hastens to point out defects before passing on to beauties. Johnson's use of Latin words with an English idiom is no less pedantic than Milton's principle of using foreign idioms in his native language. Johnson, Drake considers, was probably driven to use Latinisms by his attachment to the works of Sir Thomas Browne. The style of the *Rambler* is well suited to a scientific treatise, but not to popular essays: "almost every sentence . . . is replete with abstract substantives taken from a learned language, and therefore unintelligible to mere English readers." Obscurity is not the only fault of these Essays; there is a "monotony . . . which . . . envelopes every character and subject introduced into the work." Though his grammatical inaccuracies are few, Johnson's desire of "imparting unusual dignity and importance to his diction" "drove him into numerous *licentious constructions and inversions*." The "parallelisms, the triads and the antitheses of the *Rambler*, occasionally the sources of great richness and splendour, are so abundantly employed as to pall upon the ear; and if, as is frequently the case, the subject demand rather simplicity than ornament, their adoption must excite either ridicule or disgust."

But, on the other hand, given a sublime subject, Johnson has no equal in harmony, propriety and energy. His precision in the choice and use of terms, one of the first requisites towards a perspicuous style, is a remarkable characteristic of his composition. His long words, "abstract, and of classic derivation," are formed on native analogies, and despite their heavy effect, they are so clear in their meaning, and so appropriate to their respective ideas that they express the author's meaning with complete accuracy. Johnson's harmonious arrangement is praised as imparting "to forcible and

the writings of Steele and Addison, have been published between the close of the eighth volume of the *Spectator* and the commencement of the year 1809; by Nathan Drake, M.D., London, 1809. Vol. i, part ii, Essay i contains an account of *The Literary Life of Dr. Johnson*.

¹ I, ii, 211.

² *Ibid.*, 255-66.

sonorous [words] . . . the utmost dignity, melody and nerve." He is happy in the choice of his metaphors, and the richness of his style elevates the thought. As a result, his manner is "perfectly original": Johnson is the most correct of authors, yet he combines his correctness with dignity, warmth and strength.

Johnson's style had been widely used as a model:¹ Drake remarks on its usefulness for that purpose. The adoption of his style "by the Critic, the Orator, and the Historian, has been frequently attended with the best effects; as the weight, the splendour, and dignity of the subjects have often been such as would most happily harmonize with the strong and nervous periods of their prototype."² On topics of a more familiar kind, however, "it would surely be no mark of judgment" to employ the phraseology of the *Rambler*.

Drake is agreeably surprised by the "apparently unlaboured, free, pure and flowing" style of Johnson's letters;³ and finds the *Prayers and Meditations* written "in a strain remarkable for its simplicity and plainness."⁴ These are, however, minor divisions of Johnson's work. Reviewing his productions in general, Drake passes a final judgment: ". . . the style which he adopted as an author was polished with great care and corrected with indefatigable attention. It has beauties of peculiar lustre and defects which are very apparent; but it has, upon the whole, greatly contributed, and more than the style of any other writer, to the correctness, the dignity, and the harmony of English composition."⁵

Against the points urged by Johnson's detractors, his more friendly critics prepared a strong defence. They explained the splendour of his diction as being due to the expansiveness of his thought. He was precise, both in the choice and the use of his terms and he never indulged in empty verbiage. If he was fond of Latinisms, he was always careful to form them on English analogies, and he introduced no foreign idioms. To this purity and clearness was added an unremitting care for the harmony and dignity of his

¹ Drake quotes Courtenay as naming Goldsmith, Reynolds, Burney, Malone, Steevens, Hawkesworth, Jones (poet) and Boswell as having been influenced by Johnson's style. To this list he adds the names of Dr. Robertson, Dr. Blair, Mr. Gibbon, Mr. Burke, Dr. Leland, Madame d'Arblay, Dr. Ferguson, Dr. Knox, Dr. Stuart, Dr. Parr, Dr. Gillies, Archdeacon Nares, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Roscoe and Dr. Anderson as those who have "in a greater or less degree, founded their style on that of the author of the *Rambler*."—I, ii, 281–83. Courtenay's list may be found in *A Poetical Review of the Literary and Moral Character of the late Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, London, 1786, pp. 22–4.

² I, ii, 283.

³ *Ibid.*, 452.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 458–9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 481.

construction. Consequently, he wrote in a style remarkable for its elegance and strength, which had improved the standard of English prose: its influence was likely to be of abiding value, and his prose was to be a model for future ages.

Such were the opinions of the opposite camps. It is notable that his later critics tend to pay more and more attention to his influence, and to his fitness as a model. As the late Sir Walter Raleigh once observed, "Johnson continued to be the most influential teacher of English prose until Macaulay, by introducing a more glittering kind of antithesis and a freer use of the weapons of offence in criticism, usurped his supremacy."¹ Johnson's reputation then declined rapidly, and Macaulay himself was in no small measure responsible. But even *he* modified his views. In 1831, in his Review of Croker's edition of Boswell, he had condemned Johnson's language as *universally* and systematically vicious: he found Johnson to have used "those strong plain words, Anglo-Saxon and Norman-French, of which the roots lie in the inmost depths of our language" less than any other eminent writer. Some twenty-five years later when the impetuosity of a brilliant youth had been modified by a more mature judgment, he softened his remarks.² He now says that Johnson was "evidently too partial to the Latin element in our language." In some passages he finds a "weighty and magnificent eloquence." The *Preface to Shakespeare* is "not in his best manner." That Macaulay allows to a man, whose diction he had called universally and systematically vicious, all of whose books he had found written in the same language, a *best* manner, implies a notable change of view. This change is proved when he refers to the *Lives of the Poets* as in a lighter and easier style than the earlier works. Macaulay had ceased to regard Johnson's "manner" as entirely barbaric.

Johnson's prose style has the same effect on most of his readers as it had on Macaulay. It starts with a bad name: the word "Johnsonese," with all its less favourable implications, gives the unwary a prejudice against his diction. But because of the weighty thought and comprehensive mind which require the long words to express themselves; the skilful use of balance and the pleasing harmonies of the cadence, Johnson's "manner" meets with growing

¹ Introduction to his edition of E. S. Barrett's *Heroine*, Oxford, 1909, p. xii.

² In his *Life of Johnson*, reprinted in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., Vol. xv, pp. 468-70. This life was written in 1856.

appreciation as it becomes more familiar to us. Its faults have been censured often enough by its critics : but the perfect style has yet to be formed. He worked with a definite aim in view—to raise the standard of English composition. Though we may not agree with all his views, though we may not applaud all his methods, his achievement marked an epoch in the history of English prose. His composition embodied the ideals of a century marked by tireless inquiry into the principles of prose technique. From such a man the present age has much to learn.

BEOWULF AND GERMANIC EXORCISM

BY GUSTAV HÜBENER

THE great Indo-Germanic sagas, *Beowulf*, *Siegfried*, *Heracles*, *Grettir*, and many others, which present a hero who fights some goblin foe in the form of man or dragon, have been hitherto considered largely from the literary standpoint. The mythological interpretation given, for instance, by Müllenhoff has now been entirely dropped. R. W. Chambers¹ is right in asking why we should consider these figures of the old tradition other than as they are presented. There is, for instance, no hint in the text of *Beowulf* that the hero is a god or that the demon Grendel and his mother "represent" anything such as the tempest, malaria, or long dreary winter nights. The subjectivity of such an explanation is to-day clear to all serious scholars, and it is to be hoped that the theory, which has been influenced by false psycho-analysis and declares the demon to be "really" an inferiority complex and Grendel's arm a phallic symbol, only needs to be disclaimed as a modern myth. This explanation also points to things not mentioned in the text itself, which alone can provide the basis for a scientific interpretation.

Is there, however, an indication of literary relationships in the subject connection of the sagas, or in other words, wherein lies the justification of the prevailing historical saga method of to-day? In order to answer this question let us first examine the above-mentioned line of research.

Taking the likeness or similarity of the saga motives into consideration, the literary method aims essentially at tracing their historical connection, their reciprocal influence, and above all their origin itself to a far-distant fundamental form, a story or a fairy-tale. It is thus well known, that first Deutschbein² and later Gaidoz³

¹ R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1932, p. 46.

² *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, I (1909), p. 103-19.

³ Cûchulain, *Beowulf et Hercule*, Paris, 1921.

established connecting links between the Celtic tale of Cúchulain and the Anglo-Saxon *Beowulf*, the most essential being that both heroes remain behind alone at night in the dwelling-place and lapse into a kind of frenzy against the demon, which is immune against all attacks by weapon. Gaidoz and later Brandl¹ associated Heracles as well as Beowulf with a fight against the hydra and other monsters.

Gaidoz regards the above-mentioned points of similarity in the three sagas as being historically related in the sense that in spite of their difference in form they have developed out of one "thème très ancien," in other words, out of an old tale, a kind of folk tale, which he believes to be widely spread already in Grecian-Roman times. On the other hand Brandl discusses the possibility of a direct literary influence of the Heracles material as contained in *Æneid* (eighth book) on the formation of the Anglo-Saxon epic.

These are only two examples of this literary motive theory which I have mentioned. It is well known and it is very explicitly stated in the excellent research report contained in R. W. Chambers' *Beowulf: An Introduction* what a great number of Nordic and Celtic sagas have been connected with *Beowulf* in the sense of such literary motives. If all these relations should be admitted, then my previously voiced suspicion² seems to be justified, that in this case the explanation of the activity of the *Beowulf* poet has been unconsciously influenced by the scholar's own working methods. The modern *Beowulf* scholar has evidently confused his own method of collecting notes with the poetic activity and inspiration of the old *Beowulf* poet.

F. Panzer's³ interpretation is essentially the same. He abstracts certain fundamental formulæ from a great number of folk tales and regards these as influences on the development of the sagas. For instance, he traces the Siegfried and Beowulf sagas to the "Son of the Bear" group, the fundamental form of a widely-spread fairy-tale. The essential features are as follows. The hero, often brought up in a bear's den and exceedingly strong, resists a demon in a house, a feat unequalled by his comrades. He mutilates it and follows it into a cave under the earth. Here he must once more fight against the supernatural. Often the victory is only won

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XIV, p. 161-67.

² G. Hübener, *England und die Gesittungsgrundlage der europäischen Frühgeschichte*, Frankfurt/Main, 1930, S. 313.

³ *Studien zur Germanischen Sagengeschichte*, München, 1910-1912.

with the help of a magic sword which is found there below. The rope with which the hero is lowered beneath the earth often plays a rôle, as well as the treacherous attitude of his followers who fail to draw him up again. F. Panzer traced this "Son of the Bear" group of tales right through the whole range of Indo-Germanic tradition and thus came to the above-mentioned conclusion (p. 425), "dass nicht das Märchen ein gesunkener Mythos ist, vielmehr umgekehrt in den berührten Mythen poetisch-religiöse Ausdeutungen und Weiterbildungen des älteren Märchens zu erkennen sind." Thus Panzer's standpoint is also a literary one, based on the history of poetry, in so far as he regards the sagas of Indo-Germanic tradition, *Siegfried*, *Beowulf*, *Heracles*, etc., as mere variations of a special form of tale. He considers them to be mere products of a literary imagination and this is all the more emphasized by the fact that he takes the fairy tale itself as the fundamental form which alone accounts for the likeness and similarity of the "motives" in the above sagas.

It now remains to be shown that the *exclusive* consideration of these traditions from the standpoint of a formal history of poetry, their historical derivation (by the application of chains of dependency) from *one* fundamental form, one single unique product of poetical imagination is incorrect. Scholars applying this method have discovered a great number of parallel motives in fairy tales and sagas and have thus been successful in an unintentional way which will be explained later. Of course the theoretic possibility of a reciprocal influence of folk traditions in the form of sagas on each other and especially their expression in poems is not to be doubted. But the proof must be exact. The best criterion of such an influence would be the likeness and similarity of certain heroes' or place names, just as this has been shown, for instance, in the various texts of the Horn and Havelock sagas. To prove this is impossible, however, in our group of sagas representing the fight of a demon. Only their subject-motives are the same or similar. The name of the hero of the Geats, Beowulf, refers to an old god of agriculture and fertility, Beow (cf. Chambers, *Introduction*, p. 87). Its connection with *wulf* indicates an historical hero, as I previously showed.¹ At the time of nomenclature the god was, so to say, called upon, just as, for instance, the Icelfander Thorolf did in the case of Thor when he gave his son Stein to his "friend" Thor (cf. *Thule*, Vol. VII,

¹ G. Hübener, *loc. cit.*, S. 313.

p. 22). Moreover, the rest of the framework of the action, the Baltic Sea peoples among whom it is placed, the Danes and Geats, Hygelac's raid into the land of the Franks, the haunted house, the hall Heorot in Zealand, everything is historical and definite. It is impossible to connect all these elements with the Grettir saga. Here also the framework of the events is undoubtedly historical and unique. The hero, Grettir Asmundarson, is an historically authentic figure. He was born in Bjarg in the north of Iceland in the year 996. There is further exact historical evidence about his life as a hero and later as an outlaw up to the year 1031 (cf. *Thule*, Vol. V, p. 6). Nor in the case of *Heracles* is there any reason for doubt, in so far as the nomenclature is concerned, that it originally referred to an historical personality (cf. Kretschmer, Glotta 82). The reports about the deeds of the heroes are thus to be considered as historical traditions according to their form. They are meant to be believed, they refer to actual events. It is therefore wrong to apply the literary motive theory here, just because of these irreducible historical elements in the framework of the sagas. In the case of the Grettir saga, whose historical character cannot be overlooked, scholars have tried to find a way out by considering part of the action, in fact, the fights against the demon, as "mythische und märchenhafte Züge" attached to an historical figure (cf. *Thule*, Vol. V, p. 6), i.e. as fantastic embellishments. But the tone in which Grettir's ghost adventures is related is in no way fairy-like nor different from the general realistic style of the prose tale. In the other traditions too the ghost reports are detailed and vivid and not at all formally differentiated from "credible" events. That is in any case remarkable.

The Oxford ethnologist, Miss Beatrice Blackwood, relating her recent experiences in the Solomon Islands, confirmed the fact that the fairy tale is different in its form, even to the tone of voice of the original teller, from the saga or tale which is meant to portray reality in the metaphysical or historical sense. Even to-day we also differentiate the "Märchentön" in the oral story style.

But not only the unique names, historical framework, and the tone of the saga which is to be believed are in themselves opposed to the treatment of the fights against the demon as mere products of the imagination. The fact that this material is so widely spread must also be explained. If it is only poetry, fairy tale, or product of imagination, why was the early European imagination so much

interested in it? It may be that this imaginative energy is able to put more colour into the threads of life than reality, but the latter creates them. Where does the imagination receive the impulse to devote itself just to this idea of the heroic victory over the demons in the special form of night-fights and fights in the cave? One glance at the very widely-spread existence of the material, as Panzer and Chambers, for instance, point out, in the sagas and fairy tales of all European peoples and times, from the Celts to the Russians, from the Northern Teutons to the Romans, proves that it was in the centre of life, the object of the strongest life-power, the most concentrated mental energy: belief. Belief regulates the form of life and expresses itself in manners and customs *before* all poetry or even fairy tales. Poetry and fairy tales are the reflection and echo of the life which is moulded in manners and customs. The following conclusion is therefore irrefutable, *that the heroic fight against the demon points back to real life, to a real existent early European custom.*

Further evidence in favour of this statement is contained in the following details, viz. six groups of facts and considerations based on them. They explain why one of the most widely spread and psychologically important traditions of the early Indo-Germanic culture and its surroundings has been hitherto entirely misunderstood and wrongly explained.

I. The fight against the demons is found among all peoples. It is that phenomenon connected with the fundamental structure of the soul which we also call expulsion of obsessions, or exorcism. The preliminary condition for the obsession is fear, the idea of fear which among primitive races often develops into a hallucination, which in turn is regarded and experienced by them as demons. The idea of obsession can even lead to the dissociation of personality, to the identification of personality with the demon or several demons. As the American psychologist, Morton Prince, points out in his *A Dissociation of a Personality* (1910), certain nerve diseases take the same course. The variety of claims made on the ego by the obsession is shown by the fact that the demon speaks to the sufferer, *out* of him and gains complete control *over* him. The expulsion consists in the interruption of the idea of fear in its supremacy over consciousness, in the deviation from it and the recovery of self-control by the sufferer. The entirety of the ethnological material reveals a great variety of methods of expulsion.¹ The essential thing is that in

¹ G. Hübener, *loc. cit.*, pp. 77 ff.

most non-European systems of culture the expulsion is confided to spiritual authority, to the magician, the wise-man, Schaman, the priest, etc. He, who alone represents and provides the connection with the supernatural, is also considered alone capable of breaking the forms of the fear of existence, above all, the fear of death and the dead, viz. the demons. He names the demon, threatens him, and fights him. Thus the Chinese priest, when he is called to a family where a malicious ghost haunts, goes in full robes and attacks the spirit with a carved sword made of peachwood.¹ The blade of the sword bears a magic inscription. The sheath as well as the handle of the weapon is bound with red strips of cloth. The priest's cloak is also red, a colour of which ghosts are extremely afraid. After having burned perfumed candles on an altar and offered up prayers, in which he prays the gods to lend him power, he calls on the demons to go away. His assistants sound the gongs. At last he goes before the door of the house and brandishes the sword about in the air in order to hinder the return of the demons. A Bengalese told me that in Bengal the demon within the patient is beaten. The exorcist says to the evil spirit: "Will you go out?" He asks and delivers blows until the demon in the sufferer declares, "Yes, I will." But after this declaration of willingness the exorcist requires further proof. He makes the demon within the sufferer lift big water pitchers with his teeth as a proof of its honest intention.

In Africa the most prevalent form of expulsion is that which seeks the favour of the demon through sacrifice, the kind of exorcism which is also to be found in India (cf. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. IV, 1911, p. 605).² In Melanesia the obsessed are left more to themselves (cf. Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society*, Vol. I, p. 164); only the process of self-healing, induced by the patient naming the demon, is furthered by the lighting of a fire and the burning of twigs of fine-smelling herbs. Very important also is the method of imitable self-conquest practised by the exorcist who yields to the obsession by calling on the demon, works himself up more or less artificially into a state of obsession, and then opposes it in a *Gegen-ekstase* (ecstasy of opposition). Primitive people explain this by saying that the exorcist is visited by a spirit stronger than and superior

¹ Navarra, *China und die Chinesen*, 1901.

² In India I studied recently an exorcism in which a knife and a peacock feather were used. This seems prevalent in the North-West. In Bombay I saw an exorcism in which the demons were driven away with a whip. I shall give later on a thorough description of my observations in India.

to the demon. We know that among the Malays (cf. W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic*, London, 1900) the exorcist (Parwang) believes that he is supported by a tiger's spirit. This *Gegenextase* is increased by means of narcotics, cries, beating of drums, shouts, and applause from the observers and also by dancing. Thus we here have an imitable example of the exorcist's inner struggle with the negative idea of the demon. The same belief prevails among the Red Indians, e.g. the "fight" between the magic doctor and the demon (cf. Preuss, *Eingeborene Amerikas*, p. 16).

II. This enumeration could be continued and parallels found in every non-European culture, as all ethnologists will admit. The explanation of what we would nowadays call mental disease as a demonic obsession and its cure by means of expulsion is a generally accepted anthropological fact. It is only among the early Indo-Germanic culture systems that these phenomena have not yet been found. In modern descriptions of the early Germanic era and ancient Greece there is no mention of the exorcist or obsessions.

If we glance back at the great Indo-Germanic traditions about fights with demons, and demon-fighters such as Beowulf, Siegfried, or Heracles, is it possible to reject the assumption that they were very successful exorcists and that their fights with demons were real, just as real as all the above-mentioned events, which still take place in Indian and African native villages? Certainly not.

Thus the nature and importance of the expulsion for a primitive culture, and incidentally the assumption of an identification with the great sagas about demon fights, has been explained by a general ethnological comparison. The details may now also be explained by ethnological and folkloristic parallels. In this way, too, the main idea of this article, the above-mentioned identification, will be further confirmed. Let us first examine *Beowulf* more explicitly.¹ The starting point of the epic is the fact that the Danish king Hrothgar, popular with his people because of his success in war, wishes to build a magnificent festival hall, Heorot. Everywhere, whenever man takes a step out of the everyday sphere into the unknown, the fear very easily arises that this may lead to some kind of bad luck or misfortune. It is the same here. The fear of misfortune is connected with the building of the new hall. And this fear is fundamentally supported by the idea of the demon, which is ever prevalent among primitive peoples (if we disregard real accidents

¹ G. Hübener, *loc. cit.*, pp. 73 ff.

such as illnesses, which are not mentioned in *Beowulf*). The occupants of the new hall are as a mass subject to the suggestive idea of the demon Grendel, which drags them away from their sleeping benches to his haunt at the bottom of the water at night, when the heroes are resting after their beer. Here, therefore, is a danger against which many customs, practised even up to the present day, are used as a means of defence, *e.g.* the ceremonious laying of foundation stones and other building rites. Human sacrifices were often made in order to win the favour of the gods and demons. Children were built into walls, as reported from Cape Finisterre (cf. *Le Folklore de France*, by Paul Sébillot, Paris, 1907). In Germany wine and salt are used to appease the demons in new buildings. In Burma the pillars are blessed during the building of a house, as Mr. Hamer (Oxford) told me.

The new building is the special circumstance which makes Heorot a haunted house. The idea of the haunted house needs no further explanation. It is still widely spread in England, more so than on the Continent, where it is, however, also based on folklore. Beowulf, the hero of the Geats, now dares to enter the haunted hall. Here he hears of his own fame abroad and this increases his self-confidence. He decides to wait at night and defy the demon. Of course, the demon appears. Tense expectation mingles with fear and both excite the power of imagination and auto-suggestion, until it all results in an hallucination. But Beowulf is determined to defy the feared object. The heroic instinct of self-assertion struggles with fear. And so a state of ecstasy arises out of the reciprocal influence of increase of fear and the will to fight it. Beowulf raves. "Swæg ūp āstāg nīwe geneahhe; Norð-Denum stōd atelic egesa, ānra gehwylcum, þāra þe of wealle wōp gehýrdon" (*Beowulf*, XI). The result of the frenzy is that the demon withdraws. The fear is overcome. Fatigue and calmness set in. Next morning Beowulf declares to the approaching crowd that the demon has been expelled (cf. ll. 837 ff.). As a visible sign (*tacen sweotol*) of the victory Grendel's arm, which Beowulf had pulled out, lay before the haunted house. A similar scene follows in a cave under the water, the real home of the demon and his mother. The main point here is that the hero in the fight with the mother is unable to do anything against the monster with his own sword (a sign of her demonic nature), but only with the old hereditary sword which he finds in the cave. Its age is recognizable

by the inscription in runes and the decoration with pictures of dragons. In the second part of the poem a fight with a dragon is described. The fact that this dragon lies in a tomb on the treasure of an extinct family shows that it is also a ghost or a ghost-like demon.

The expulsion scenes through which Grettir must pass correspond exactly with those of Beowulf. Just as the latter sleeps in Heorot Hall, so does Grettir in Thorhalstadir, where a mysterious dead shepherd, Glam, torments the imagination of the inhabitants and is believed to be active in the howling of the stormy winds on the roof at times of accidents. But Grettir awaits him at night, lying on the sleeping bench. The idea of the ghost develops in him through auto-suggestion from expectation to hallucination. There all at once Glam stands before him in the semi-darkness and stares at him with his terrifying eyes. Here again Grettir lapses into an ecstasy through the heroic determination not to yield to fear. He raves and strikes about, so that the frozen earth and grassy clods, with which the log hut was covered, fall down. At last he collapses, exhausted, and loses consciousness. The hallucination is gone. But on the morning after the fight he must still have had so much strength that he felt conscious of a victory over the demon and proclaimed it to the terrified peasants. So the mental epidemic which had previously led to the desertion of the whole valley was stopped. The valley was at last rid of the ghost.

In a second tale Grettir experiences exactly the same hallucination as Beowulf and also what can be briefly called a *Gegenextase*, until he collapses in a cave under a waterfall, that is, under the earth where, according to popular Germanic belief, the demons have their home.

Here we see that the two traditions correspond in all details and are also the same as the formula of the "Son of the Bear," which Panzer derives from a very widely spread fairy-tale tradition. In connection with the above-mentioned arguments for the general occurrence of exorcism at all (see I), this similarity of detail forces us to assume the existence of a uniform exorcistic folk-custom which lies at the basis of the above-mentioned traditions.

Here we may further explain by parallels some of these details as elements of a uniform process of the cure of obsessions. Firstly, a few words about the susceptibility of primitive mankind to hallucinations, especially in circumstances where the fear of the supernatural is present. Even a civilized townsman who has once

lost his way in a lonely forest will, if he is honest, confirm the belief that one sees ghosts in the dark. Numerous examples of the hallucination of ghosts are to be found in *Haunted Home and Family Traditions of Great Britain*, by I. H. Ingram. This contains the report of a mathematician, I. Caswell, written in 1695 about a haunted country home in the neighbourhood of Portsmouth. He there saw a ghost just as distinct as a living being :

" thinking it might be some fellow hid in the room to fright me, I put out my arm to feel it, and felt no manner of substance till it came to the wall ; then I drew back my hand, and still it was in the same place."

It is not necessary to give further examples of the frequency of such experiences even up to the present day : it is already sufficiently well-known. (Examples taken from the past are contained in J. G. Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 532 ff.). The instinctive reaction of Beowulf and Grettir to overcome by raving the fear fixed in the hallucination may be shown by means of an inexhaustible mass of ethnological material. I have already quoted Navarra with regard to the Chinese exorcist who strikes a gong. I myself heard young fellows from the neighbourhood of the Lake of Lucerne cracking their whips on the evening of the Festival of Epiphany in order to drive away the demons. It is also stated that in New Guinea the ghosts of the slain are driven away by means of loud yelling and the beating of drums (cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 1911, Vol. III, p. 170). A similar example :

On the evening of the day on which they had tortured a prisoner to death, the American Indians were wont to run through the village with hideous yells, beating with sticks on the furniture, the walls, and the roofs of the hut to prevent the angry ghost of their victim from settling there and taking vengeance for the torments that his body had endured at their hands (cf. Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 178).

In connection with our analysis it will be readily understood that in these crises of the fear of existence, these obsessions, primitive man in order to regain self-confidence grasps for the instrument which helps and has helped him most in the struggle for existence, namely, the sword. This is actually the case in *Beowulf* where, just as in the " Son of the Bear " tale, the hero finds the victorious sword in the cave of the demon itself. It is described as a specially old magic sword and that in turn reminds us of the ceremonial sword used by the Chinese exorcists. H. Zimmer (Heidelberg) drew my

attention to the King in Kalidasa's *Sakuntala*, who exactly reproduces ancient customs in so far as he goes to the help of the Brahmans of the hermitage and practises exorcism with his sword, when their sacrificial rites are threatened by demons at night (End of Act 1). The fundamental nature of the above-mentioned episode becomes clearer when we consider the fact that the use of sharp-edged weapons is forbidden under certain circumstances among the Eskimos of the Bering Straits, in order not to wound the ghosts (cf. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Vol. III, p. 237). Moreover, iron is used in all European folk customs as a kind of magic against fairies and witches (cf. Horn, "Der altenglische Zauberspruch gegen Hexenschuss," *Festschrift für Hoops*, Heidelberg, 1925). It can be seen from Germanic literature that the dead were buried with their swords in burial caves, and on the other hand these same old swords were later used as a magic instrument against them; moreover, that it was instinctive and customary in the fight against the hallucination of fear for the hero to grasp for the sword previously tried in physical fight.

At first sight it appears too difficult to explain by means of psychological folkloristic method the arm of the monster, which the hero shows to the people on the morning after the first watch. This visible token of the purely psychic event cannot have been an hallucination, but the explanation is to be found in the Indo-Germanic as well as Germanic custom of opening the grave of the ghosts when they appear and rendering the corpses harmless by burning them or cutting off the limbs. This is told, for instance, about the haunting Hrapp in the Icelandic tales of the People of the Valley of the Salmon Water (Chapter 24). In the times of ancient Greece we have evidence that one tried to make the dead harmless as ghosts by tearing out their limbs (cf. E. Rhode, *Psyche*, 1894, pp. 202 and 253). Beowulf shows the arm actually cut off Grendel's body to demonstrate the harmlessness of the ghost. This arm episode is directly attached to the ghost-watch in the comparatively late poem (cf. G. Hübener, *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, 9 Jahrgang, No. 26). This custom of exorcism which can be attributed to Indo-Germanic times is confirmed by a mass of general anthropological parallels. Frazer (*Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, Vol. II, p. 271) points to the mutilation of the enemy's corpses in order to make their ghosts harmless. He mentions the observation made by A. Oldfield (*On the Aborigines of Australia*)

that the natives cut off the thumbs of their dead enemies in order that their ghosts may not be able to throw spears. W. E. Nelson (*The Eskimo about Bering Straits*) tells us that, when a bad man died, the Eskimos used to cut the sinews of his arms and legs "in order to prevent the shade from returning to the body and causing it to walk at night as a ghou!" (cf. Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 272).

Frazer correctly concludes (p. 273) that these examples imply that many mutilations which the natives practised on their dead enemies do not originate in blind hatred but in the cool calculation of the best way possible to protect oneself against the vengeance of the ghosts. It is very remarkable in this respect that the Japanese noble of the tenth century, the hero Watanabe-no-Tsuna, whom F. York Powell rightly compared with Beowulf, cut off the arm of the demon with whom he fought and put it in a stone coffin.

III. But this general anthropological material and the possibility of explaining every detail of the Indo-Germanic tradition by this material are not the only reasons for assuming the existence of heroic exorcism in the early Germanic folklore and its preliminary stage. Its own inner nature, the whole structure of Germanic civilization as it is described in all the sources, points directly to the metaphysical importance of the hero. In my book on *England und die Gesittungsgrundlage der europäischen Frühgeschichte*, Chapter 1, paragraph 6, I showed how the band of warriors was really the centre of the common life, when the Germanic civilization struggled out of its own predominantly magic past and out of the more or less strongly magic influence of the surrounding Slavonic, Finnish, and Celtic tribes. Here there was no trade in the magic of distinctions and titles as in ceremonial men's unions of a primitive kind. Here that personality ruled which distinguished itself by a courageous deed of the sword. The band was free to elect as leader that hero whose authority they in turn supported; and the leaders competed in the gathering of the hardest and strongest following. Kingship among the Teutons depended on the band of warriors, as history shows. The band was the instrument by which the chiefs obtained more power in opposition to the kings coming from a more magic past. The most important field of distinction for the hero was then the courage and the strength of the physical deed. But just because he stood in the centre of life and personified his fear in the demons, he had to fight them. It can even be said that he would not have got this central position if he had not shown the

courage to fight the demons. It is possible to prove this too, if necessary, by ethnological parallels. Frazer tells us (*The Golden Bough*, Vol. I, p. 338) that, according to a Melanesian account, the power of the chiefs among the natives rested upon the popular belief that they derived a supernatural power from their intercourse with the spirits or ghosts. The moment this was no longer believed about a chief his power began to diminish. In the lives of the heroes in the early Indo-Germanic traditions the deeds of the sword are connected in a remarkable way with the victories over demons. The extraordinary deeds of valour and strength during childhood, just as well as the secret and the distinction of their birth, were common to all. Panzer in his book on the Siegfried saga (p. 41) tells us about the miracle of unusual breast-feeding. In the *Helga-Kviða* (1-21) Siegmund's son stands already in his coat of arms when only one night old. In the *Volsunga* saga, as well as in the *Thidrek* saga, Siegfried is an unusually strong and clumsy boy. Siegfried cleaves the anvil in two with his sword. According to Greek tradition Heracles strangles serpents when only a child. The young Beowulf makes his great swimming achievement. All these are fantastically exaggerated popular interpretations of a heroic being. In *Grettir* they are replaced by realistic tales of fights as an outlaw or challenger of mighty and rich peasants to the "Holmgang." The essential thing is always that the physical deed of strength and the necessary courage suggest to the hero the defeat of the demons. It is the popular belief that the right and the possibility of the hero of the sword to expel the demons is inherent in him. Both kinds of deed are connected as a matter of course. If one thinks of the characteristics of *Grettir* which resemble those of the Berserkers or the raving frenzy of Heracles (cf. Robert, *Die griechische Helden-sage*, Berlin, 1923, p. 629), and the raving of Beowulf, there seems to be no doubt from a medical point of view that these exorcists, who in their impulsiveness very often broke the law, were unusually strong in vitality and courage. At the same time they seem to have acted like epileptics. This accounts for the ecstatic ability and also explains their susceptibility to hallucinations exceeding general primitivity. The power which these heroes who filled the office of exorcist had over their fellow beings must have been tremendous. They were distinguished by the highest power of the sword as well as by the highest authority of the metaphysical saviour. This explains why they, like all extraordinary human beings, excited not only strong

positive, but also strong negative feelings. This fact explains the feature of the saga that the hero himself very often meets with treason. This is Siegfried's fate, and so also the ageing Beowulf, bereft of the highest strength of the hero, is deserted by his comrades.

IV. Heroic exorcism as a custom prevalent in the early European period can be traced not only in saga traditions, but also in direct evidence of its existence right up to modern times. For instance, I myself was able to trace an uninterrupted line of demon exorcists and expulsions from the early Middle Ages up to the eighteenth century in the surroundings of the Lake of Lucerne (cf. "Der heroische Exorcismus der nordischen Rasse und der Winckelried-sagenkreis am Vierwaldstättersee," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift*, 1931). It begins with an ancestor of Arnold Winckelried whose death in the battle of Sempach made the respected peasant family of Nidwalden famous. Peterman Etterlyn's Chronicle, 1507, gives a detailed account of his fight with the demon in the neighbourhood of the village Oedwylr on the banks of the Lake of Lucerne. He is succeeded by a line of other exorcists who always practise against the dead, the ghosts and the demons, which can be traced in connection with practically every cave round the Lake of Lucerne. Niederberger (*Sagen, Märchen und Gebräuche aus Unterwalden, Sarnen*, 1908) gives an account of the much-feared ghost in the Schwander Alp, Unterwengen: "It had caused much loss and damage through sudden killing of cattle and spreading of bad diseases. It was therefore decided not to let the cattle graze on the Alp any more. At the same time there lived a very pious and learned priest (Seminarherr). The latter was begged to go to the Alp and exorcise the ghost. This man willingly went to the Alp and addressed the ghost." Lütolf (p. 246) identifies this Seminarherr with the Jesuit father, Dr. Johann Baptist Dillier von Wolfenschiessen, who died in 1745. He was known as the "Seminarherr" among the village-folk because he had founded the still existent Kollegium in Sarnen. Lütolf states that this exorcist caused the three ghosts "to forsake their Alpine hut and retreat to a rock-cave nearby which they continued to haunt." Here again we have the case of an historically authentic personality as exorcist.

This Germanic custom, which has been preserved in the Swiss mountain districts, corresponds exactly to the belief of the still primitive Lapps in Scandinavia, who attribute all events connected with danger and fright in their existence, such as the death of cattle,

disease, and other accidents, to the action of the dead (cf. Wolf von Unwerth, *Untersuchungen über Totenkult und Odinverehrung*, Breslau, 1911). There the magician, in order to get rid of the misfortune, appeals to the supernatural. He enters a mountain cave, the abode of the dead, to bring salvation by appeasing the demons. He smears butter on a stone to achieve this end. Sébillot (*Le Folklore de France*, Vol. I, p. 475) states that there was a cave in the neighbourhood of Orival in the valley of Fécamp, which was regarded as the abode of evil spirits. There is still to-day a tradition that people went into this cave in procession in order to ban the demons. Right up to the time of the French Revolution the priesthood of Saint-Suliac practised exorcism in the Guivre cave. The same is reported from Provence, where about twenty or more demon caves are in existence. In France these caves are also often near water, for example the one on the Seine, in which the dragon housed which Saint Samson eventually killed (cf. G. Hübener, *England und die Gesittungsgrundlage der europäischen Frühgeschichte*, p. 94).

V. The foregoing facts show that heroic exorcism was and is practised against ghosts and demons among the simple peasant-folk of the various European countries right up to modern times. When, on the other hand, events of the same structure are related in early saga traditions (also in fairy-tale form) then the unprejudiced thinker is unable to reject the conclusion that this very folk custom was also in the Indo-Germanic period not only a fictitious motive but really existent. Nevertheless, the exponents of the literary-historical theory, without denying the reality of the folk-custom and the natural conclusion of early existence, still claim that, in spite of everything, at least a part of the saga tradition had a purely literary character. It could perhaps be argued that such an artistic poem as *Beowulf* was a sort of historical *novelle*. I do not deny the justification of such a consideration. I myself have previously pointed out that *Beowulf*, in spite of all the poetic means of expression in its demon scenes, does not reveal the same realistic force in the portrayal of the horror as, for example, the Grettir saga. The main subject of the poem is not so much the demonic element with its terrible effects and the overpowering greatness of the courage and strength which the heroic exorcist has to show, but actually the whole traditional material is used to illustrate chivalrous life and forms. This difference which I have drawn has lately been very

well explained psychologically by Dr. Glunz (Cologne), who states that the Anglo-Saxon *Beowulf* poet describes a very distant event, not a haunted house in the near neighbourhood, but in distant Denmark. Such differences in the real character of the saga traditions must be admitted, as already stated, though they have not been previously recognized as such. The question also as to what connection there is between these novelistic forms of traditions and the proven exorcistic customs has not been previously considered, just because the customs themselves were not recognized. The material and its realistic value had to be made clear first before research into its possible literary shape in this or that form of saga could be commenced. Only on this basis can we solve the problem of the probable literary embellishment of the saga. In future, research will have to be made according to the following principle. Those common features in the sagas which can be shown to exist all over Europe and at the same time to be spread ethnologically are customs. Those where this cannot be proved are fantastic additions. Those tales which are explicable in their general contents according to the above method are a reproduction of the custom and thus sagas in the precise sense. Many tales which are to-day regarded as fairy tales also belong to this category. Fairy tales, on the contrary, are the distant fantastic echo of the reality of the custom.

VI. The above considerations are sufficient to justify the assumption of an exorcistic custom as the foundation of the most important Indo-Germanic saga traditions. The method of interpretation thus established will become all the more convincing owing to the fact that phenomena which have been previously inexplicable are now comprehensible. I would here like to draw attention to at least two examples. It is only with reference to the basis of the already-mentioned psychological-ethnological explanation of the function of the sword in exorcism that the passages in *Beowulf* dealing with swords are comprehensible. It is Grendel's supernatural nature which is proof against Beowulf's sword, which had already shattered so many helmets. The passage (l. 804) "ac he sigewæpnum forsworen hæfde" is otherwise incomprehensible in its relation to Grendel. It is solely the magic nature of the old sword found in the cave which explains its victory over the monster and the cutting off of Grendel's head.

I believe that this interpretation may also throw more light

on the general structure of the Siegfried saga. I can here in conclusion only sketch the application of my theory to this saga in brief. In my opinion we here have to deal with an earlier more magical type of exorcist than the one in *Grettir* and *Beowulf*. Siegfried is also a man above the ordinary, right from birth. In the *Edda* poems (ed. G. Vigfusson and F. York Powell) Siegfried says in the old play of the *Volsunga* (verse 76): "I came into the world as a motherless child. I had no father like the other sons of man. I stood alone." The deeds of prowess in his youth bear ample testimony to his extraordinary nature. In the Nordic form of the saga the archaic features of his education by a blacksmith are preserved. Owing to the extraordinary power of iron a magic importance was attributed to blacksmithcraft in the transition period from the Stone Age, as the *Wieland* saga shows. This social magic is combined here with the distinction of the hero by strength. In the prose story of the *Volsunga*, just as in the German blacksmith and dragon song, the blacksmith Regin incites Siegfried to the dragon-fight and prepares a special sword for it. But the distinctive feature of this story is that Siegfried is assisted by magic (he is able like all magicians to change his form and takes, for instance, that of Gunnar), although he tells Regin who gives him a sword that courage is above all necessary for the deed (*Volsungenspiel*, Chapter 7).

In Northern Europe we have the idea of the dragon (cf. Panzer, p. 88) as demonic guardian of the treasure, but at the same time as a bewitched man, who is a brother of the blacksmith Regin.¹

So Siegfried, prepared and distinguished by descent, deeds of prowess and education, experiences the terrors of the fight against the demon. As a result of his victory he is held to be superior by magic, invulnerable and wise. The effect of the demon-watch and the demon-fight is therefore to be compared from the point of view of ethnology to the effect of the primitive initiation rites. In this connection Miss Beatrice Blackwood, the well-known Oxford anthropologist, observed on Bougainville Island that the young people first had to meet the dead represented in terrifying pillars before they are regarded as men. Considering the widely

¹ The prose tale of the *Volsunga*, translated by Paul Heimann, *Thule*, vol. xxi, p. 71: "Later on Fafnir murdered his father," continued Regin, "and hid the body. I, however, did not receive anything of the treasure. He became so malicious that he withdrew to the wilderness and begrudged everybody else the enjoyment of the treasure; he changed into a very wild worm and now lies on the treasure."

spread existence of the dragon-fight sagas (cf. Lutz Mackensen re "Drache" in the *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*), it may be assumed that exorcisms of this kind were a general custom among young warriors in the Indo-Germanic culture.

The salvation and superiority gained by a victorious ghost-fight are shown in two separate features, in the invulnerability attained by the dragon blood and in the universal knowledge by eating a dragon heart. Frequently the drinking of the dragon blood imparts the knowledge of the bird language and, through this, universal knowledge. These features can be interpreted by ethnology. The idea that blood drinkers are clairvoyant is shown by Frazer: "The Sabāans explained the inspiration thus produced as due to the obsession of the blood drinker by demons whose food they held blood to be. They expected to gain the gift of prophecy by entering into communion with the demons." The fundamental idea of the European world of sagas and Siegfried's saga is, therefore, that the exorcist drank the blood of the dead distinguished by extraordinary demonic strength in order to gain this strength and courage. This is the meaning, too, of the head-hunting in Brazil and in the South Sea Islands, where the hunter cuts off and keeps the heads of dreaded adversaries in order to acquire their strength.

The connection of clairvoyance with the understanding of the bird language is not difficult to explain. The prophetic power of birds on the one hand and the understanding of their language by specially gifted men on the other hand is to be found everywhere in the Edda and elsewhere in the Indo-Germanic culture. It is the custom of the Augurium, ahd. vogalvarta, as. fugalhvata (cf. Jakob Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Vol. IV). The raven was sacred to Apollo, the god of prophecy. The two ravens, Huginn and Muninn, sit on the shoulders of Wotan and whisper everything they see and hear into his ear (Jakob Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Vol. I, p. 134). But a raven also sat on the cloak of Mithras. The prophet Elias was fed by the ravens at the brook of Cherith (I. Kings 17). Frazer (*Folklore in the Old Testament*, 1918, Vol. III, p. 25) further states that, for instance, the Lilloet Indians of British Columbia believe that those who have the raven for their guardian spirit possess the gift of prophecy.

The frequency of these individual features which interpret the extraordinary salvatory strength of the dragon-fighter, Siegfried, according to primitive experience emphasizes over and beyond

the single saga the central importance of heroic exorcism for the entire early Indo-Germanic age. But this importance can only be adequately reproduced, as all our considerations have demonstrated, by the idea of the folk-custom performed in reality.

We hope that our idea of "heroic exorcism" is and will be the key to the chief treasure vault of the saga tradition and that the future will bring forth further discoveries.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE REVELATION TO THE MONK OF EVESHAM

THE only extant copy of this work is a printed one of the late fifteenth century, and presumably from the press of William de Machlinia.¹ The introductory caption states that the revelation occurred in 1196: "Here begynnyth a meruelous reuelacion that was schewyd of almyghty god by sent Nycholas to a monke of Euyshamme yn the days of kyng Richard the fyrst And the yere of owre lord. MC. Lxxxvi."; and other than Roger of Wendover's abridged version of the story in the *Flores Historiarum*, sub. ann. 1196, no further proof has been forthcoming that an early MS. version of it existed. A comparison between Machlinia's copy and Roger's entry goes a long way to convince one that such a MS. did exist in Roger's day, for they are remarkably similar in details of fact and expression, and Arber² had every justification for concluding "that there seems therefore no escape from the belief that the ostensible date of the Revelation is the true date of its composition." An entry in Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicon Anglicanum* gives confirmation to Arber's supposition, and places beyond any further doubt the existence of a MS. version in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, if not in 1196 itself. Under that year Ralph gives a very brief synopsis of the story, and in conclusion refers the reader who might desire further details and spiritual edification to the book itself, which he had obviously read and no doubt had at hand when making his entry: "Sed quisquis modum et ordinem visionum istarum, necnon et qualitatem tormentorum pro qualitate criminum, et personarum potentium cognitionem, gestum, et habitum, atque diversas mansiones beatorum plenius desiderat, legat libellum in quo prædictæ visiones diligenter exaratæ sunt, et magnum divini timoris incitamentum ex inspectis profecto reperiet."

¹ See Arber's introduction to his reprint of the Revelation, *English Reprints*, 1869, pp. 1-7.
² Pp. 7-8.

Ralph's version, although very short, is in some small details closer to Machlinia's text than Roger's lengthy paraphrase; *e.g.* he begins his account of the young monk's condition more accurately, "qui nuper postquam de sæculo ad religionem transierat . . ." as beside "turnyd wyth feythfull deuocyn fro thys worldys vanyte to the lyfe of a Monke . . .", while Roger makes no mention of the fact. So also in such phrases as, "per quindecim menses," (Ralph), "by the space of xv monthys" (Machlinia), beside Roger's "per annum integrum et tres menses," etc. These are small points, but they help to prove that the Machlinia reprint followed the early MS. version fairly closely. Whether this was in Latin or English it is impossible to know; there is nothing to prove that it was not in English, but being a work of religious fiction, and of a kind that embodied a good deal of doctrinal teaching, the probability is that it was first written in Latin, and later, on its becoming popular, translated into the vernacular for the sake of the laity.

As against Machlinia's and Roger's versions, Ralph's contains one small discrepancy. According to the testimony of the two former, the revelation came to a young monk of Evesham: "In a monasterye callyd Euysshame there was a certen yong man . . .", and "... monachus quidam Eveshamensis cœnobii . . .", but Ralph assigns it to a monk of Eynsham, "Quidam monachus exstitit in Enigsamensi cœnobio . . ." Flourishing religious houses existed in both places at the time, but in the Latin cartularies from Eynsham quoted by Dugdale (*Monast. Anglic.* iii, i), there is no form *Enigsamensis*, the nearest being *Egnesham* (beside *Eynesham*), where the *g* is a palatal. Possibly *Enigsamensis* should read *Euigsamensis*. Ralph, living at Coggeshall, in Essex, would perhaps be more liable to be in error than Roger, who lived in Bucks. But on the other hand, the mistake might be one of transcription.¹

In default of other proof, Evesham must for the present be accepted as correct.

CONSTANCE DAVIES.

¹ Stevenson, in his introduction to his edition, *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon*, Rolls Series, 1875, translates as Eynsham, but refers, p. xvi, n. 6, without comment on the difference of place-names, to Roger's account (*i.e.* under the name of Matthew Paris).

ALFONSO FERRABOSCO

IN his note on Alfonso Ferrabosco the elder (*R.E.S.*, April, 1932), Captain B. M. Ward says that in the *Tellers Views of Payments*, "from Mich. 1583 to Mich. 1588 Ferrabosco's name is entered in the ordinary way, but there is no record of any payments and no entry to explain why he was not paid." The explanation may be gathered from the reports to the Papal Secretary of State of the Nuncio (Dandini) in France, contained in the Vatican Archives, series *Nunziature, Francia*, Vol. XV :

June 23, 1578 (decipher) : " Here (*i.e.* Paris) is arrived one Alfonso Ferrabosco, Bolognese, who was brought here by the Cardinal of Lorraine as his musician, and went to serve the Queen of England, against the will of the Cardinal, where he has been for many years favoured and remunerated."

Ferrabosco wishes to return to Italy, and says he made his mother's death a pretext to ask for a few months' leave, from which he intends not to return. He protests he has always been a good Catholic, now asks pardon for his errors, curses the servitude he suffered, and asks for a protection. The Nuncio, however, is suspicious of him, because he has visited the English Ambassador and ate meat at his house on a Friday. But with his Court connection in England he may be useful. August 5 : Ferrabosco is about to depart for Italy, and with him " one Agromonte Lef " (corrected in later letters into *Ratelef*, *i.e.* Egremont Radcliffe, for whom see *D.N.B.*) " who is brother of the Majordomo of that Queen (Sussex, Lord Chamberlain), who has been her prisoner for a time and pretends to be incensed against her, but in truth goes in her service." (June 26.)

October 5 : " Ferrabosco left for Italy 6 days ago, and goes to Bologna." Radcliffe and he must have parted company, since the former was executed in Flanders. May 10, 1579 : an Italian in Paris who has connections with England and lived there six years, reports that during those years he noted

that Alfonso was never at mass, and ate meat indiscriminately, and lived like the others who served the Queen, and that a few days before he departed he went to mass secretly in the French Ambassador's house, so as to obtain with him the credit which perhaps he may have shown.¹

¹ *per poter hauer da lui la fede che forse doura hauer mostrata.* I suppose the second " he " is the Ambassador, who might certify Alfonso's attendance at mass or give him a testimonial or recommendation. Or *fede* might mean a certificate to that effect, which he, Alfonso, might be expected to exhibit.

And the same man tells me that while here he has eaten often on fast days with the English Ambassador, who eats meat, as I wrote: ¹ from which one may argue his reputation as a Catholic. The gift which the Queen made him before he left was in so much real estate, or allowances (*assegniamenti*), from which he drew at once seven or eight thousand *scudi*, which he said was to pay his debts.

Later, the Portuguese ex-Ambassador to England confirmed this story: Ferrabosco even attended the heretical preachings, and came to mass in his house just before he left. On May 26 Ferrabosco was evidently in prison (? in Italy), for Dandini reports that he "has great hopes of being speedily liberated."

It would appear, then, that Ferrabosco left England on leave, and that by 1583 (if not 1582, for, says Captain Ward, that year's records are missing), the Exchequer was holding up his annuity because there was no sign of his return—he was neither dismissed nor retired, but was overstaying his leave. The reduction in payments after 1576 may mean that he had hypothecated part of his annuity for a lump sum, but we should expect some record of that. The Nuncio, though suspicious of Ferrabosco's orthodoxy, had evidently no suspicion of his political activities, especially since he proposed to use him himself. Are we not spy-hunting rather much these days? Any man might report on his visits abroad without being a secret service agent.

One last glimpse of Ferrabosco's affairs may be added. Dandini reports, September 1, 1579, that

When Ferrabosco departed hence he left his wife here, whom he had brought here from England, and now that he sends for her to Italy, she is provided with 100 *scudi* for the journey by one Petruccio Ubaldini, Florentine, as I am told, an apostate, heretic, and most wicked man, who is in London, she not having been able to have the use of certain moneys which I am told the husband has in Lyons, and she will set out soon.

Ubaldini was the illuminator and painter, Ferrabosco's colleague in the production of masks. For him see *D.N.B.* and Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*.

W. L. RENWICK.

¹ *che mangia carne come scrissi*. The indeterminate *che*, and indeterminate punctuation, make it uncertain whether one should not translate "[and] that he eats meat as I wrote."

THE SITE OF THE WHITEFRIARS THEATRE

OPPOSITE p. 312 of his useful *Shakespearian Playhouses*, Dr. Joseph Quincy Adams reproduces a portion of a sixteenth-century survey of the Whitefriars precinct discovered some years ago by Mr. A. W. Clapham in the Print Room of the British Museum and reproduced by him in *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* in 1910. In discussing this in his chapter on the Whitefriars Theatre, Dr. Adams writes :

The part of the monastery used as a playhouse—the Frater—was the southern cloister, marked in the plan, "My Lords Cloyster." The "kitchen by the yard" mentioned in the document just quoted is clearly represented in the survey by the "Scullere."

Sir Edmund Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, p. 516, takes exception to this identification, and opines that the playhouse "is more likely to have been the hall also shown at the north-west corner." This surmise is substantially correct. One finds it stated in Concannen and Morgan's *History and Antiquities of the Parish of St. Saviour's, Southwark*, 1795, p. 193, that the old Whitefriars theatre was situated near the entrance to the Temple on a spot formerly called Playhouse Yard, but which had been lately demolished. A rough indication of the site would be the junction of Essex Street and Temple Lane. See the plan of the old precinct, with latter-day indications, in Clapham and Godfrey's *Some Famous Buildings and Their Story*, p. 264.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

THE ANONYMOUS MASQUE IN MS. EGERTON 1994

A. H. BULLEN, in Appendix I to Volume II of his *Collection of Old English Plays*, seems to have been the first to remark that the anonymous masque in Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton 1994, ff. 212-23, contains a long passage apparently derived from Chapman's *Byron's Tragedy*. The correspondent lines are as follows :

Masque, f. 215^r.

"lo[ue]

for thy sake will I feathered all my thoughts
and in a birds shape fflew in to her bosome
the Boosome of dezert thy beautilous mistris
as Iff I had ben driuen by the hauke

In y^t swete sanctuary to saue my liffe
 she smild on me cald me her prety bird
 & for her sport she tyed my little legs
 in her ffaire haire proud of my golden fsetters
 I chirpd for Ioy she Confident of my tameness
 soone dissintangled me & then she perchd me
 vpon her naked breast ther being rauishd
 I sung wth all my cheere & best of skill
 she answerred note for note relish for relish
 & ran deuission wth such art and ease
 That she exceeded me :

Iud[gement] Ther was rare musicke

lou[e] In this Swete strife forgetting wher i stood
 I trod so hard in streining of my voice
 That with my claw I rent her tender skin
 which as she felt and saw vermilion ffollow
 Stayninge y^e cullor of adonis bleeding
 In Venus lap wth Indignation she Cast me from her

Will : That ffortune be to all y^t Iniure her

lou[e] Then I put on this shepheards shape you see
 & tooke my bow and quiuer as in reuenge
 against y^e birds shooting and ffollowing them
 ffrom tre to tre she passing by beheld
 and liked the sport I offered her my prey
 w^{ch} she receued and asked to ffeele my Bowe
 w^{ch} when she handled and beheld the beauty
 of my bright Arrowes she began to beg em
 I answered they were all my riches yet
 I was content to hazard all and stake em
 downe to a kiss at a game at chess with her
 wanton quoth she beinge priuy to her skill
 A match Then she wth y^t dexterrytey
 answered my challenge y^t I lost my weapons
 now Cupids shafts are headed wth her lookes "

Byron's Tragedy, II. i. 20-51

(Cupid)

" I (having left my Goddess mother's lap,
 To hawk and shoot at birds in Arden groves)
 Beheld this princely nymph with much affection,
 Left killing birds, and turn'd into a bird,
 Like which I flew betwixt her ivory breasts
 As if I had been driven by some hawk
 To sue to her for safety of my life ;
 She smil'd at first, and sweetly shadow'd me
 With soft protection of her silver hand ;

Sometimes she tied my legs in her rich hair,
 And made me (past my nature, liberty)
 Proud of my fetters. As I pertly sat,
 On the white pillows of her naked breasts,
 I sung for joy ; she answer'd note for note,
 Relish for relish, with such ease and art
 In her divine division, that my tunes
 Show'd like the God of shepherds' to the Sun's,
 Compar'd with hers ; asham'd of which disgrace,
 I took my true shape, bow, and all my shafts,
 And lighted all my torches at her eyes ;
 Which set about her in a golden ring,
 I follow'd birds again from tree to tree,
 Kill'd and presented, and she kindly took.
 But when she handled my triumphant bow,
 And saw the beauty of my golden shafts,
 She begg'd them of me ; I, poor boy, replied
 I had no other riches, yet was pleas'd
 To hazard all and stake them gainst a kiss
 At an old game I us'd, call'd penny-prick.
 She, privy to her own skill in the play,
 Answer'd my challenge ; so I lost my arms,
 And now my shafts are headed with her looks."

Bullen states that he would never otherwise have thought of Chapman in connection with this masque ; and it is still impossible to determine precisely the extent to which Chapman's authorship is in question. There is, however, evidence unnoticed by Bullen and others favouring a partial and provisional conclusion.

In the first place, it is not difficult to find many other seeming traces of Chapman's hand in the anonymous masque. Several details of the plot may be paralleled from his acknowledged works. Thus, Fortune's wings are to be seen upon the stage throughout the greater part of the action. "ffortune," it is said, "has hangd vp her wings here : & broke her wheele here se where the peeces ly here" (214^v), which may be compared with the words given to Fortune herself :

here fortune then hangs vp her wings and breakes
 her turning whele wth purpose neuer too
 depart out of Arcadia (214^r).

In Chapman's *Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn*, Fortune's wings are likewise hung in a conspicuous place, and there is described "that rich temple, where Fortune fixed those her

golden wings, thou seest, and that rolling stone she used to tread upon for sign she would never forsake this kingdom" (*Masque of the Middle Temple*, ll. 163-65), together with "the round stone (when her feet trod it) ever affirmed to be rolling, figuring her inconstancy; the golden wings denoting those nimble powers that pompously bear her about the world; on that temple (erected to her daughter, Honour, and figuring this kingdom) put off by her and fixed, for assured sign she would never forsake it" (*Comedies*, ed. Parrott, p. 442). The allegory reappears in similar form in *Byron's Tragedy* (I. i. 141-44) and in *Cæsar and Pompey* (II. iv. 136-42).¹ The relationship between Fortune and Honour mentioned in the passage last quoted exists also in the anonymous masque. "fortune," it is said,

Is a glad mother of a gallant daughter
call'd honnor (216^r).

The haunting of Desert by Danger, similarly, "danger . . . attending on dessert" (216^r), recalls Byron's statement that "danger haunts desert when he is greatest" (*Byron's Tragedy*, v. iv. 226). The figure of Time, finally, made so "full of corruption" (216^v) by the villainy of Envy that his victims cry out upon "times apostacy" (222^r), is well described in Chapman's frequent references to "the time's apostasy" (*Poems*, ed. Shepherd, p. 202^a) and "the time's corruption" (*Cæsar and Pompey*, v. ii. 112).

But there are also a number of interesting verbal resemblances to be traced between the manuscript work and Chapman's acknowledged compositions. The lines

The World
is out off fframe disorder gouerns it
Threatning to turne it all againe to Chaos (213^v)

may be paralleled by such phrases as "The world's out of frame" (*Cæsar and Pompey*, II. i. 38) and "all things now . . . Are turn'd to chaos" (*The Shadow of Night*, *Poems*, p. 4^b).² Even closer, however, is the resemblance between Fortune's declaration that

. . . we haue ben delighted
to exercise those men like to the Blackthorne
w^{ch} puts his leafe out wth most Bitter stormes (213^v)

¹ The allegory is borrowed from Plutarch (*De Fortuna Romanorum*).

² The phrase reappears in *Byron's Conspiracy*, III. i. 16.

and the passages,

... they shall see I'll hatch
Like to the blackthorn, that puts forth his leaf,
Not with the golden fawnings of the sun,
But sharpest showers of hail, and blackest frosts
(*Byron's Tragedy*, III. i. 126-29)

and

Like to the hatching of the blackthorn's spring,
With bitter frosts, and smarting hailstorms, forth.
(*Poems*, p. 250^b)

Single phrases too may be paralleled in the same way. The following list contains a number of striking instances :

"I cald you ffrom your Region of the aire" (213^v) and "This in the region of the air shall stand" (*Ovid's Banquet*, *Poems*, p. 30^b); "nor yet presume vpon our peace or saffetey" (215^v) and "In all the peace and safety it enjoys" (*Byron's Conspiracy*, III. ii. 50); "Happy & blest Arcadia" (216^v) and "Happy and blest be Irus" (*The Blind Beggar of Alexandria*, i. 72); "in a florishing peace" (216^v) and "in such a flourishing peace" (*Byron's Tragedy*, IV. ii. 235); "sofft slepe" (216^v) and "soft sleep" (*The Shadow of Night*, *Poems*, p. 4^a); "breaches blowes and batteries" (219^v) and "Blows, batteries, breaches" (*Byron's Tragedy*, III. i. 130); "the sicke feathers tane out of your wings" (223^v) and "his broken wings Full of sick feathers" (*An Invective*, *Poems*, p. 434^a).¹

It is also possible to find many points of general similarity. The use of the word "only" with the meaning "alone" in "thy onely sake" (215^v) and "vertue is onely here" (214^v) recalls such phrases as "Virtue's only sake" (*Sir Giles Goosecap*, v. ii. 122), "Worth's only want" (*Pro Vere*, *Poems*, p. 249^b), and "your only sake" (*The Gentleman Usher*, IV. iii. 113), while the anonymous author's marked fondness for puns and verbal jingles, and his habit of using rime to emphasize an important aphorism are also characteristic of Chapman. Even in its references to "this earthly parradice" (213^v) and "earths onely Parradice" (217^v), the masque once more directs attention towards Chapman; his fondness for this oxymoron appears in such phrases as "Oh, 'tis the Paradise, the Heaven of earth" (*All Fools*, I. i. 111) and "this earthly paradise of wedlock" (*All Fools*, III. i. 245). In its use of several of his favourite words—"monster," "confines,"

¹ Cf. *The Tears of Peace*, *Poems*, p. 123^b.

"counterfeit," and "corruption," for example—and in its long lists and complicated allegories, finally, the masque again recalls his work.

But it would be a mistake, on the strength of this evidence, to attribute the masque as we have it to Chapman. Not only is the general style quite unlike his, but the date of composition, which can be fixed with reasonable certainty, is later than that of his death (1634). When, in the masque, Juno has administered the purge to Time, Love remarks, "all y^e comes from him is swearing oathes and lyes off all kinds & cullors he ffarts diurnalls and weekly Intellegences" (221^v). The *New English Dictionary* gives no instance prior to 1641 of the use of the word "Intelligencer" (or "Intelligence") with the meaning "newspaper"; the earliest entry reads "1641 R. BRATHWAIT (*title*) Mercurius Britannicus: or, the English Intelligencer."¹ Other authorities² give 1643 as the date of the word's appearance, and it certainly seems that it could not have gained sufficient currency before 1643 to have rendered this reference generally intelligible. And a date later than 1641 seems to be required to explain the frequent references to "vnnaturall strife and bloody warrs" (214^r). The year 1641, however, may be accepted as the earliest possible year of composition. Since, therefore, this copy had been made by "August 5th: 1643:"—the date given beneath the *Nomina Actorum* (212^r)—we may state with certainty that the masque was written between 1641 and that date.

Chapman, then, is not the author of the masque in its present form. But it is evident that the piece is either the revision by an unknown hand of a masque by Chapman, or a work, substantially original, containing important borrowings from the earlier poet. The triviality of some of the resemblances will perhaps incline the reader to favour the former conjecture; it is difficult to imagine a dramatist deliberately stealing single phrases of no particular note.

J. D. JUMP.

¹ "Diurnall," similarly, was not used with the meaning "newspaper" before 1640.

² The *Times' Tercentenary Handlist of English and Welsh Newspapers, Magazines, and Reviews*; H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers*; Mr. Stanley Morison, *The English Newspaper*.

DIGBY'S CRITICISM OF SPENSER

SIR KENELM DIGBY wrote two commentaries on Spenser: *Observations on the 22nd Stanza in the 9th Canto of the 2d. Book of Spenser's Faery Queen* and a "discourse," *Concerning Edmund Spenser*.¹ The former, written at the request of his friend, Sir Edward Stradling, with whom he had discussed this and other difficult passages in *The Faerie Queene* while on a privateering expedition in the Mediterranean in 1628, was not published till 1643.² It has been frequently reprinted in editions of the poet's works, and is of significance as one of the earliest attempts to interpret his text, having been written prior to the publication of Ware's annotated edition of a *View of Ireland* (1633) and printed almost a century before Jortin's *Remarks on Spenser's Poems* (1734).

The "discourse" was left in manuscript.³ Like the *Observations* it too was written upon request, the "desire" of "Mr. May,"⁴ translator of Lucan's *Pharassalia*. A more general study than the latter, it is concerned chiefly with Spenser's rank, learning, and language. In laudatory terms characteristic of the seventeenth century, the poet is declared "soe high aboue the reach" of the critic's "weak eyes" that the more he looks "to discerne and discry his perfections the more faint and dazeled they grow through y^e distance and splendour of the obiect." In Spenser England need not envy Greece, Rome, or Tuscany, for what "perfections" their poets have "seuerally" may be found "all in him alone." The poet has borrowed from his predecessors, but "soe happily" that where he "transplanteth . . . a flower" from their "gardens," it "groweth there fairer and sweeter than . . . where first it sprang up."⁵ In brief, Spenser's "learned workes" are proof that a "Northern climate may give life to as well tempered a brain, and to as rich a mind as where the sunne shineth fairest."⁶

¹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 41,846. Transcript in *Harleian MS.* 4153, *A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spenser*.

² Some copies are imprinted 1644.

³ It has recently been published in an appendix to E. W. Bligh's *Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia* (1932).

⁴ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 41,846. Thomas May, with whom Bligh suggests Digby was intimate about the time the two were included in Suckling's *Session of the Poets* (*Sir Kenelm Digby and His Venetia*, 220).

⁵ *A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spenser*, 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, verso 1.

A scholar and scientist himself, Digby is attracted by the depth and scope of Spenser's knowledge. In *Observations on the 22nd Stanza*, the poet's "learned Spirit" is said to be "no whit inferiour to the most famous men that ever have been in any age;"¹ in the "discourse," his knowledge in both "diuine and humane" learning is "without . . . controuersie," the "greatest that any Poet before him ever had, excepting Virgil."² To Digby, as to Milton, Spenser's was not a "meere sprinkling of seuerall sciences," such as "many Poets are contented withall," but "a solide and deepe insight in Theologie, Philosophy (especially the Platonike) . . . the Mathematicall sciences," and finally such sciences as "depend of these three," which the critic carefully explains includes all others! The poet was not a scholarly recluse, however, but a man of practical mind, for "where he treateth Morall or Politicall learning, he giveth evidence . . . that he had a most excellently composed head to obserue and gouerne mens actions." Had "his owne choice or fortune . . . giuen him employment in the Commonwealt," he might have been "eminent" in the "actiue part," an opinion substantiated by *A View of Ireland*.³

Digby's comments on Spenser's language are fresh and unbiased, adequate evidence that he understood the essential characteristics of his poetry. Never was "weight of matter" better joined with "maiesty and sweetness of verse" than by Spenser, a quality remarked by commentators later, but less often linked with Digby's third phrase, "and propriety of language."⁴ The poet expresses himself in "a way . . . peculiar to himselfe"; he "bringeth downe the highest and deepest misteries that are contained in human learning to an easy and gentle forme of deliuey"; he wieldeth his matter "as he pleaseth"; and then, as if aware how often the thought is lost in the music of the poet's stanzas, Digby adds, "so cunningly" that if the reader "heed him not with great attention, rare & wonderfull conceptions will unperceived slide by him."⁵ But "dwelling" a while upon his words, the reader "shall feele a strange fulnesse and roundesse" in all the poet "saith."

There is no Sidneyan rebuke for Spenser's "obsolete words" and "ancient formes" of speech, his "Chaucerisms," as Fuller

¹ *Observations on the 22nd Stanza in the 9th Canto of the 2d. Book of Spenser's Faery Queen*, ed. 1643, 3-4.

² *A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spenser*, 5.

³ *Ibid.*, verso 5

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, verso 4.

called them, but recognition that they are a basic element in the verse, and as such worthy of "much prayse,"¹ a criticism of no mean importance at this time, for not only complaints registered against the poet's archaisms but modernizations of his text in current editions of his works show only too plainly that his "outworn words" were presenting difficulties for his readers.² It was Digby's opinion, however, that the archaisms were employed not "out of any affectation" but purposefully to "expresse more lively and more concisely what the poet would say."³ Having their "native rudeness" polished yet retaining the "maiesty of antiquity," they now want nothing of the "elegancy" of the "freshest speech." Whereupon the critic enlarges upon the significance of the poet's achievement. Were the "true worth" of Spenser's poetry "knowne abroad," it would be an inducement to the "best witts and most learned men of other parts" to study the "long neglected English language." He hopes Spenser's works "will be a meanes that the english toungue will receive no more alterations and changes, but remaine and continue settled in that forme it now hath" after the manner of the Greek, the Latin, and "the Tuscan toungue,"⁴ retention in its present "perfectness" being advocated to the advantage of future poets in imitating the excellencies of their predecessors. Like most academicians, Digby has no fear that "fixation" will stifle the language. He is confident that not any fate or length of time will alter it as it is now used "out of" Spenser's "schoole," only some "generall innouation . . . that may shake as well the foundations" of the nation.⁵ His exception is prophetic in view of the change⁶ which did come a few years later introducing criteria so little conducive to the admiration of Spenser's "grandam words" that at the end of another quarter of the century Davenant reports the poet's language has "grown the most vulgar accusation . . . laid to his charge."⁷

¹ *A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spenser*, 2.

² See the *Faerie Queene*, ed. 1609, the *Works*, ed. 1611, 1617.

³ "Although his assiduity in Chaucer might make his language familiar to him," verso 2.

⁴ "At this day the same as it was left about 300 years agoe by Dante, Petrarche and Boccace," 3.

⁵ Verso 3.

⁶ Ironically enough this change was in great part stimulated by Jonson, Spenser's successor "in the Laurell crowne," who Digby foretells is "to build up that worke whose foundations" Spenser "soe fairly layd," verso 3, 4.

⁷ Preface to *Gondibert*, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn, ii, 6.

William Bosworth reminds us that Digby often called Spenser the "English Virgil."¹ His admiration in this brief commentary is paramount. When one lays it aside, he is assured that although the critic may have "deliuered" his "rude and undigested conceptions" with "a hoarse voyce and trembling hand,"² when he read, Digby felt "a strange fulnesse and roundesse" in the poet's words.

JEWEL WURTSBAUGH.

A NOTE ON THOMAS MAY

It is probably impossible to discover the full extent to which Thomas May was engaged in journalistic activity on the side of Parliament during the Civil War, but one pamphlet which has not yet found a place in the list of his works can be attributed to him with tolerable certainty. John Taylor, who seems to have believed that May wrote for the Parliamentary news-sheets, definitely states that he was the author of an account of the battle of Newbury.

In the opening paragraph of *Mercurius Aquaticus*, . . . Printed in the Waime of the Moone Pag. 121, and Number 16, of *Mercurius Britanicus*. 1643, Taylor wrote: "Be it known to all People to whom these presents shall come, that I *Thorny Aylo Water-Poet Laureat* (if my place be not sequestred for the use of *Tho. May* for his Poeticall relation of his Excellencies Victory at *Newbury*, and more Poeticall interpretation of TOUCH NOT MINE ANOYNTE). . . ." On Sig. B2 of the same pamphlet, headed "*Mercurius Aquaticus* his Answer to *Britanicus*," Taylor, in imitation of what *Britanicus* had written of *Aulicus*, says he was informed *Britanicus* "was not the Act of one but many," which for a while made him think "Mr. Saltmarsh the Scribe," "the Close-Committy the Informer," and "*Tom May* the Contriver and chiefe Engineer, but that I thought he was better at Translation then Invention."

In *John Taylor . . . to John Booker*, 1644 (Spenser Society reprint, pp. 3 and 8), he twice refers to May: "But thou with thy Consorts, *May*, *Wither*, *Britannicus*, the *Scout*, the *Dove*, and all the Rabble of lying and reviling Rebels, cannot so much as scratch my reputation, " and ". . . when it is well beaten, mix it

¹ *Arcadius and Sepha*, ed. 1651, 4 verso.

² *A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spencer*, I.

with the Braines of *Booker*, *May*, *Wither*, *Mercurius Britannicus*, *Prinne*, and two or three hundred Knaves Braines more, . . ." *Booker* refers to the former of these two passages in his answer, *A Rope Treble-twisted for John Taylor the Water-Poet*, Sept. 28, 1644, p. 6.

Andrew Marvell, with a reference to May's disappointment when Davenant was chosen Laureate, hints at May's pamphleteering activities in his lines *Tom May's Death* :

Must therefore all the World be set on flame,
Because a Gazet writer mist his aim ?

The author of *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus*, 1645, p. 16, makes *Aulicus*, the Royalist periodical on which there are continual attacks in *Britannicus*, object to May as a juror :

For though a Poet hee must him confesse,
Because his writings did attest no lesse ;
Yet hee desir'd hee might be set aside,
Because hee durst not in his truth confide :
Of *May* among twelve moneths he well approved,
But *May* among Twelve men hee never lov'd :
For hee beleev'd that out of private spite
Hee would his conscience straine, t' undoe him quite.
Hee likewise of offences him accus'd,
Whereby his King *Apollo* was abus'd :
And with malicious arguments attempts
To prove him guilty of sublime contempt, . . .

It would seem, therefore, that some of his contemporaries suspected May of contributing to *Mercurius Britannicus* ; they knew he wrote pamphlets and John Taylor specifically mentions two. The author of Number 1 of *Britannicus Vapulans* shared Taylor's belief that May was responsible for an account of the first battle of Newbury.

This fertile Age hath produced such a number of Mercuries, that it would pose *Trismegistus* himselfe to derive that pedigree. *Gallobelgicus* is now forgotten, and the greasie ghost of *Nathaniel Butter* spreading news about the world walks about in Print no more. But there is *Aulicus*, and there is *Rusticus*, . . . and here is *Civicus* and *Scoticus*, and *Aulicus*, and you the youngest who therefore would seem the witest, Mr. *Britannicus* ; besides the Diurnalls and the Scouts, and the Intelligencers, and the Remonstrances, all of the same stamp, Mercuries all ; . . . and to say truth, many Pamphlets there are put forth, which are in nature, though not in expresse termes, very Mercuries. . . . Another though he calls not himselfe Mercury, yet is *Majanatus*, who failing of the laureat wreath, envies the Crowne itselfe, and puts his fictions into grave prose, as if he stood to be City Chronicler : and sure however Poets have got an ill name, I had rather beleieve in the supplement of *Lucan*, then the relation of the battell at *Newbury*.

There are several contemporary accounts of the battle, but there seems to be only one which May could have written. This is *A True Relation of the late Expedition of His Excellency, Robert Earle of Essex, for the Relief of Gloucester. With The Description of the Fight at Newbury*. . . . London, Printed for Ralph Rounthwait. 1643. An order of the House of Commons, dated October 7 and signed by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the House, that Rounthwait should print the Relation and "that none else shall reprint the same without the further Order of my Lo. Generall," shows that it is the official Parliamentary account. Thomason dates his edition Aug. 26.

Taylor said it was a "Poeticall relation"; the author of *Britannicus Vapulans* doubted the veracity of its "grave prose." The latter may have had in mind the beginning of the last paragraph:

Thus, gentle *Reader*, hast thou had a description of the whole expedition in a narration plain & particular, if too much particularity have not made it tedious, and perplext both the stile and thy patience. But for excuse take this; besides that truth, not *Rhetoricke* was here aimed at, the *officers* names are so particularly exprest in every action, that thou mayest know where to enquire the certainty of every thing, and what men of worth will upon their honours make it all good.

Taylor may have meant that May's story was imaginative, but it was probably the style of such a passage as the following that he considered "poetical":

The extremities were great, and required as great blessings to relieve them. *Gloucester* besieged by a great and gallant *Army*, where the flower of *English Nobility and Gentry*, with courages as high as became their births, were the fierce besiegers, and where his *Majesty* in person was to encourage them. His *Excellency* fourscore miles off, with a wasted and almost inconsiderable *Army* at that very time, when every day false reports were raised that the *City* was taken, to discourage him from marching, that march lying through Countries already harried by the *Enemy*; insomuch, that all considered, it was a question, *which was more wonderfull that he undertook it, or that he did it*. But to cure all these extremities, *Gloucester* had such a *Governor* and such a *Garrison*, as, besides their hourly labours and dangers in fight, had constancy enough to hold out till there were left but two barrels of powder. His *Excellency*, besides his own magnanimity, (being suddenly recruited) had an *Army* so full of patience, as that with one fortnights pay at *Colebrook* (being much in arreare) they were content to march against all those difficulties; and to expose themselves in that long Expedition, not only against the sword of an enemy too strong in probability for their encounter, but to another enemy too strong for mankind to resist, *Famine*.

This is not the style of the usual Civil War pamphlet.

Taylor was probably mistaken in ascribing to May the "more Poeticall interpretation" of *Touch not mine anynted*. William Prynne is generally supposed to have written *A Vindication of Psalme 105. 15. (Touch not mine Anynted, and doe my Prophets no harme) from some false Glosses lately obruded on it by Royallists. Proving, That this Divine Inhibition was given to Kings, not Subjects; . . . 1642*, and his name appears as author on the title-page of the third edition. Two replies at least were written, *The Sovereignty of Kings: . . . 1642*, and *A Revindication of Psalme 105. 15. . . . Cambridge, 1643*. Prynne answered the former in *A Revindication of the Anynting and Priviledges of Faithfull Subjects . . . 1643*, but neither is at all likely to be by May.

The Life of a satirical Puppy, called Nim, 1657, has been doubtfully attributed to May on the strength of the initials T.M. on the title-page. In the 20-page advertisement of his publications issued in 1656, No. 226, Moseley gave the author as W.D.

C. H. WILKINSON.

OTHELLO AND REVENGE FOR HONOUR

THE worthless play, *Revenge for Honour*, was entered in the Stationers Register in 1653 as the work of Glapthorne, and published in the following year with Chapman's name on the title-page. Professor Parrott, in his edition of Chapman, has noticed three parallels between it and *Othello*. One of these has an interest which has not, I think, been noticed. The passage in *Revenge for Honour* is as follows:

I prize
My life at no more value than a foolish,
Ignorant Indian does a diamond,
Which for a bead of jet or glass he changes.

Since the play is evidently of later date than *Othello*, and since there are other, even closer, parallels between the two, this passage may, I suggest, be considered as finally proving the correctness of the reading "Indian" in *Othello*, v, ii, 347.

There are, however, other reminiscences of *Othello* besides those mentioned by Professor Parrott. Perhaps the most convincing

of these is the first line of Abrahen's soliloquy after he has been made Caliph :

And who can say now Abrahen is a villain ?

Moreover, it is at least possible that the important part played by a handkerchief in the plot, was suggested by Shakespeare's play. It cannot have been taken from Knolles' *History of the Turks*, the principal source of *Revenge for Honour*.

Such borrowing from Shakespeare by his contemporaries must always possess a certain interest as evidence of his popularity. What gives a special significance to the resemblances between these two plays is that one whole scene in the later play has been modelled on *Othello*, III. iii. The scene in question is the one in which Mura, the dupe of the villain, Abrahen, succeeds in making the Caliph Almanzor jealous of his son, Abilqualit. The relevant part of the scene begins thus :

Mura : I do not like this.

Almanzor : Like what ? Valiant Mura,
We know thy counsels so supremely wise,
And thy true heart so excellently faithful,
That whatsoe'er displeases thy sage judgment
Almanzor's wisdom must account distasteful.

With this we may compare *Othello*, III, iii, 35 :

Iago : Ha ! I like not that.

Oth. : What dost thou say ?

and again, 118-120 :

For I know thou'rt full of love and honesty,
And weigh'st thy words before thou givest them breath,
Therefore these stops of thine fright me the more.

Like Iago, Mura pretends to think his victim is loyal :

Not that I dare invade with a foul thought
The noble Prince's loyalty.

Cf. Iago : For Michael Cassio,
I dare be sworn I think that he is honest.

Both *Othello* and *Almanzor* begin by regarding themselves as incapable of suspicion :

Alm. : Too much care
Of us informs thy loyal soul with fears
The Prince's too much popularity
May breed our danger ; banish those suspicions.

and again :

My Abilqualit's goodness
Would ne'er consent with them to become impious.

Cf. Oth. : Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy, etc.

Both Othello and Almanzor regret their disillusionment :

Mura : Henceforth, I'm silent.

Alm.: Would thou had'st been so now.

Cf. *Oth.* : Avaunt ! be gone ! thou hast set me on the rack.

Both Desdemona and Abilqualit enter almost as soon as Iago and Mura have finished.

Further resemblances may easily be found, but enough have been given to show that the author, or one of the authors, of *Revenge for Honour* knew *Othello* well. But it is clear that he does not write with a printed text of Shakespeare before him, nor are these the kind of reminiscences we might expect from anyone who had seen the play only from the auditorium. A spectator would remember a phrase or an incident here and there, but hardly the structure of a whole scene in this way. It is, therefore, not improbable that these parts of the play were written by some one who had at one time, probably some years before, been associated with the production of *Othello* by Shakespeare's company. Now we know from the title-page of *Wallenstein* that Glapthorne, who is usually given some share in the play, did write for the King's men, which makes it all the more likely that he had previously been an actor in that company. This, too, is consistent with Professor Parrott's view that he only revised *Revenge for Honour*, since that view depends mainly on the identification of the play with one called *The Parricide*, written originally for the Prince's men. A dramatist writing for the Prince's men is less likely to have known *Othello* intimately than Glapthorne, who was associated with the company to which it belonged.

C. F. BECKINGHAM.

THE PRINCESS OF CLEVE AND SENTIMENTAL COMEDY

PROFESSOR NETTLETON's suggestion¹ that the essential dramatic pathos of sentimental comedy is to be found in the serious drama of Otway and Southerne as well as in the comedy of Cibber has recently been in part substantiated by significant evidence pointed

¹ George H. Nettleton, *English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century*, New York, 1914, p. 119.

out by Professor Dodds.¹ The elements which he cites as essentially sentimental are

the loyal wife whose virtue triumphs in the end; the man and maid whose love was untouched by any cynical contempt for marriage; the faithful friend; the spurned mistress who is at last married to her former lover; and the rake purged just in time for the fifth-act curtain.²

All these elements he finds in Southern's *Disappointment*, produced in the year 1684. Thus Professor Dodds claims that Southerne's *Disappointment* is the first sentimental comedy.

It is significant, however, that the elements of sentimentality peculiar to the comedy of the late seventeenth century and the early eighteenth are to be found in Lee's so-called tragedy *The Princess of Cleve*, which appeared on the Dorset Garden Stage sometime during the year 1681.³ The fact that it was not published until 1689 is probably significant for the history of sentimental drama since by that time the tragedy of feeling, the plays of Otway, Dryden, Southerne, and Banks, had become popular.

The plot of *The Princess of Cleve* revolves about the machinations of the rakish Duke of Nemours who tries to seduce the Princess of Cleve (the wife of his sworn friend) for whom he has conceived a violent passion. The Princess, though remaining faithful to her saddened husband, actually is much moved by the overtures of the Duke and conceives a fatal affection for him. The Duke himself is beloved of Marguerite, his faithful fiancée. In the end, the lovelorn Prince, after the fashion of the heroic play, runs upon Nemours' drawn sword and gets himself out of his friend's way. Marguerite, in an attempt to save Nemours for herself, disguises, allows him to enjoy her, and then unmask, thinking to assure herself

¹ John Wendell Dodds, *Thomas Southerne Dramatist*, New Haven, 1933, p. 213. Professor Dodds says that "it appears to have gone unnoticed that as early as 1684 Southerne wrote a comedy in which the entire main plot expressed the moralized emotions later known as sentimental drama."

It is significant to note that Professor Bernbaum's famous classification of Colley Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* as the first sentimental comedy (*The Drama of Sensibility*, pp. 1-2) is challenged in other quarters. Professor Nicoll corrects Bernbaum's somewhat misleading declaration for the Athene-like birth of sentimental comedy (*Restoration Drama*, revised edition, p. 251 ff.), and Professor F. T. Wood ("The Beginnings and Significance of Sentimental Comedy," *Anglia*, LV, pp. 368-92) traces scattered evidences of sentimentality from the Moralities through to Cibber.

² Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

³ Nicoll, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

of his continued affection.¹ The Princess, out of honour for her dead husband, gallantly refuses the hand of Nemours and goes into seclusion; and Nemours in the last speech of the play repents of his libertinism and promises to marry his fiancée Marguerite, much as did Loveless in Cibber's *Love's Last Shift*.

The well-known elements of the heroic play are here tinged with the pale cast of sentiment, and *The Princess of Cleve* becomes interesting as showing the transition from the heroic play to sentimental comedy. Here is the loyal wife in the person of the Princess, the faithful friend in the person of the Prince, the spurned mistress in the person of Marguerite, and the rake (purged in the last act) in the person of Nemours. Moreover, the play presents the moral domestic problem of what is to be done when the tricky passion of love oversteps the bonds of matrimony. It solves that problem after the precedent of the heroic play, except—and this is the point—that the Princess cannot marry her lover but must *enjoy* a double sorrow—one for her dead husband and one for the lover whom she has in honour forced from her. The ruse of the forlorn Marguerite, almost precisely the same as that of Amanda in *Love's Last Shift*, is used for the same purpose as that of Amanda. The difference between Amanda and Marguerite, aside from the fact that the latter is not married to her one-time lover, lies chiefly in the difference of their temperaments: Amanda is the devoted wife trying to save her husband from the evils of a wild life; Marguerite is the passionate lady, jealous of her lover's amours. In spite of her jealous temperament, however, Marguerite is an extremely pitiable lady. Nemours, belonging to the family of Wildish and Loveless, is a wild, roistering, whoremongering rake, good at heart, but intent upon seducing every woman he sees. His attempt upon the Princess sobers him and brings him to the realization that he has greatly wronged the faithful Marguerite; hence his repentance and conversion in the last speech of the play, a speech that might well have been spoken by Loveless:

Nem[ours]. For my part, the Death of the Prince of *Cleve*, upon second Thoughts, has truly wrought a change in me, as nothing else but a Miracle cou'd—For first, I see and lothe my Debaucheries—Next, while I am in Health, I am resolv'd to give Satisfaction to all I have wrong'd; and first to this Lady [Marguerite], whom I will make my Wife before all this Company ere we part—This I hope, whenever I die,

¹ See Act IV., scene i. Reference is to the four-volume edition of Lee's *Dramatic Works*, London, 1734.

will convince the World of the Ingenuity of my Repentance, because I had the Power to go on.

He well repents that will not sin, yet can ;
But Death-bed Sorrows rarely shew the Man.

Thus Lee's semi-heroic *Princess of Cleve*, acted in 1681 (fifteen years before the first so-called sentimental comedy), has in it the elements of sentimental comedy. But for the death of the Prince, the play would have to be classified as comedy. The emphasis upon pity, the domestic moral problem, the exposition of the natural goodness of man in the character of Nemours, and the repentance of the rake in the last speech make it sentimental comedy. The play well illustrates the breakdown of the heroic play into the sentimental play.

THOS. B. STROUP.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PARLEMENT OF FOULES

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,—

An eminent scholar,¹ in reviewing recently my study, "The *Parlement of Foules* in its Relation to Contemporary Events,"² undertakes to demolish my argument that Chaucer's poem had for its occasion a proposed marriage between Richard of England and Marie of France by questioning the date of Marie's death. He assembles evidence to show that the death of the princess occurred prior to the conferences reported by Froissart for her marriage with Richard. If he is right in his opinion that Marie died in December, 1376, or January, 1377, then there is nothing further to be said regarding the marriage negotiations in the spring of 1377.

But let us see what evidence he brings forward in support of his opinion. In the first place, he presents a document,³ dated January 26, 1378, reciting an order of January in the preceding year, laying out a budget for clothing for the royal family for 1377. In this document we have a warrant of 2,000 francs of gold for payments of a group in the royal household mentioned by name: ". . . nostre très chiere compaigne la royne, Charles, nostre ainsné filz, et aussi Loys et Ysabeau de France, nos enfanz, et aussi Charles de Lebret, compaignon de nostre dit ainsné filz, et aussi Henri de Bar, nostre nepveu, . . ." The fact that Marie is not named among the other royal children Professor Manly construes as evidence that in January, 1377, she was no longer living.

Since this document recites an order twelve months before, the omission of her name from the document of January, 1378, might conceivably have been due to the occurrence of her death during the year which had elapsed since the original order was issued.

¹ John Matthews Manly, *The Review of English Studies*, x. (July, 1934).

² *Three Chaucer Studies*, No. II, New York and London, Oxford University Press, 1932.

³ *Mandements . . . de Charles V*, ed. Delisle, No. 1618.

Professor Manly, however, regards such an explanation as impossible in view of a second piece of evidence. This is an order (No. 1311) for gloves, dated January 9, 1377, in which again all the royal children except Marie are mentioned. If the omission of her name in this document supports Professor Manly's inference, this document would carry the date of her death back into the preceding December, because the expenditures for which payment was then made were incurred on December 8 and Christmas Eve.¹ On the other hand, Marie's name does occur, as Professor Manly himself notes, in an order (No. 1306) dated January 5, 1377, though this *mandement*, like the other, had to do with robes for the preceding Christmas season.² In other words, of these two documents which record payments for the same occasion, Christmas Eve, 1376, one mentions Marie whereas the other does not. This in itself should make one cautious about basing any conclusion on the omission of Marie's name in one of them.

Indeed, pursuing exactly the same line of argument, Professor Manly might have carried Marie's death back to a much earlier date. For there is another *mandement* (No. 1193), dated January 4, 1376, for clothing, which is similar in every respect to the one which he quoted. In this *mandement* Marie's name does not appear, although mention is made of "... nostre très chier et ainsné filz Charles, ... nostre nepveu Charles de Lebret, ... Ysabel, nostre fille, ... Loys nostre filz, ... nostre nepveu Loys de Lebret, ... filz du conte d'Armignac, ..." But this is not all. For it is to be observed that this document of January 4, 1376, recites an order for "le premier jour de l'an derrenierement passé . . ."; namely, March 25, 1375. Accordingly, applying Professor Manly's own reasoning we should now be forced to conclude, not that Marie died as early as December, 1376, but that she was already deceased March 25, 1375. Such a conclusion, however, would conflict flatly with established historical facts. We have two documents³ later than this date which mention her as living. In the first of these, her father, Charles V, under date of June, 1375, "s'engage à remplir les conditions du traité de mariage entre sa fille Marie et Guillaume, fils aîné du duc Albert de Bavière, relativement à la

¹ "Tout ce dessus livré le dit VIII^e jour de decembre. Et pour quatre autres paires de gans de chamois, doublez de chevrotin et brodez, livrez la vigille de Noel passé, . . ."

² "... pour la veille et feste de Noel darrenierement passé, . . ."

³ *Cartulaire des comtes de Hainaut*, ed. Devillers, vi., pt. 1, 395-96.

dot de cent mille francs d'or, par lui promise à cette princesse . . .” In a second set of letters, also dated June, 1375, “le même souverain renonce, pour et au nom de sa fille Marie, à toutes les prétentions qu’il pourrait avoir, à cause de ce mariage, sur les comtés de Hainaut, de Hollande et de Zélande, et sur la seigneurie de Frise, en exceptant toutefois l’adhérentement qui devait être fait en faveur de Guillaume de Bavière, de la moitié du comté de Hainaut, ainsi que le douaire de la princesse . . .” Thus we see that the negotiations for Marie’s marriage to William of Bavaria were in progress in June, 1375, and consequently that the omission of her name in the *mandement* for March cannot be used as evidence that she had died. The peril of the *argumentum e silentio* could hardly be more forcibly illustrated.

But, fortunately, in dealing with Professor Manly’s inferences as to Marie’s death, it is not necessary to rest the case on negative evidence. Marie’s name actually appears in a document a fortnight later than the order of January 9, 1377, on which Professor Manly bases his inference she was no longer living. This is *mandement* No. 1325,¹ dated January 24, 1377, in which “Charles V ordonne de payer à son amé vallet de chambre et pelletier Jehan Maudole² une somme de 239 francs un quart, à lui due ‘pour cause de certaine pelleterie bailliée par lui de nostre comandement, pour nous et nostre très chère et amée fille Marie, à Jehan Noel, nostre vallet pelletier.’” It is obvious that if Marie were still living January 24, 1377, no argument can be based on the omission of her name in the earlier *mandement* of January 9.

Furthermore, Professor Manly puts forward his conclusion as to the date of Marie’s death in direct contradiction with the statements of earlier authorities. Anselme, the compiler of the *Histoire généalogique* . . ., states that Marie “mourut jeune en 1377.”³ Anselme consistently uses old style, according to which the calendar year began on March 25, so that his statement rules out a date prior to March 25, 1377. Froissart also in recording the death of Edward III (June 21, 1377) adds the remark: “Assez tôt après trépassa madame Marie ains-née fille du roi de France.”⁴

¹ It is surprising that Professor Manly overlooked this document, which is duly entered under Marie’s name in the index although some of the others are omitted.

² Jean Maudole was the same person to whom payment for robes for Marie had previously been ordered on January 5, 1377 (No. 1306).

³ I, 110D. Anselme’s statement is repeated in the *Dictionnaire de Morel*, vii., 247. See on the subject of old style dates A. Giry’s *Manuel de Diplomatique*, 107 f.

⁴ According to one redaction: Buchon, *Les Chron. de Froissart*, vi., 105.

We are left, therefore, with the document I originally cited as affording the closest approximate date of Marie's death. This is the *mandement* of May 30, 1377 (No. 1377), directing payment to be made for her pall. Professor Manly thinks one should "inquire how long she had been dead when the bill for her *poille* was paid." According to his view of the case, the interval between her death and this payment would have been not less than five or six months. Let us see what evidence the *mandements* afford in this matter. Though few payments for similar expenditures are recorded in 1377, in three definite instances (cf. Nos. 1306, 1311, 1385) payment seems to have followed within two or three weeks after the date of purchase. In the case of this payment on May 30 to Martine la Thierre, it should be noted further that a previous payment to this same person had been ordered on April 18 (No. 1361), and that no less than five subsequent payments to her (Nos. 1439, 1440, 1507, 1508, 1545) were authorized within the next half year, viz. on August 21, August 28, two on November 7, and December 13. The *mandement* of May 30 would therefore seem to relate to goods purchased later than the previous payment made to her on April 18. Accordingly, it may be concluded with reasonable probability that Marie's death occurred within the month of May, 1377.

It remains to consider Professor Manly's somewhat desperate attempt to set aside Froissart's explicit statements in regard to the marriage negotiations. Professor Manly makes much of the fact that my quotations from Froissart's text are taken in one instance from the edition of Buchon and in another from that of Luce; and in this matter I plead guilty to reprehensible inconsistency, although this was an inadvertence on my part and was not a device adopted, as he charges, "in order to make out his [Braddy's] case." In point of fact, the use of one edition rather than the other does not affect my argument, inasmuch as in the points under discussion they show no essential disagreement. Neither in this nor in my "neglect" of still a third redaction¹ does he bring proof against the authority of the chronicler. On the other hand, it becomes the more significant that Froissart in thrice revising his statements

¹ Luce states (i. vi): "Enfin, une dernière rédaction, que tout le monde s'accorde à regarder comme la troisième, ne subsiste que dans le célèbre manuscrit de Rome." Kervyn, who separately edited this manuscript (*Le Premier Livre des Chron. de J. Froissart*, 2 vols.) calls this a fourth redaction. Regarding the redaction to which Manly refers to as the third, Kervyn states (i., pt. 3, 355): "Le récit des années 1372 à 1379 est emprunté à la narration développée, c'est-à-dire au manuscrit d'Amiens (texte de la première rédaction)."

chose to retain in each redaction his account of the marriage negotiations. If any conclusion is to be drawn from this evidence, it is not that Froissart was "changing his mind" about these meetings, as Professor Manly states, but that in the course of correcting details he was careful to preserve the essentially important statement that Chaucer figured in the conferences of 1377.¹

As a notable instance of Froissart's unreliability, Professor Manly contrasts his statements in regard to the commissioners with those in the French official documents:

On the French side we have the *mandement* of Charles V dated August 11, 1377 (No. 1425), authorizing payment to Nicolas Braque for three journeys to Montreuil and Boulogne; but the commissioners therein named do not agree with any of Froissart's lists.

This, however, conveys the wholly erroneous impression that Froissart's account is in essential disagreement with the official records. By way of reply, one need only place side by side the names in Froissart's account and in the official document. The French *mandement* names as the companions of Nicolas Braque on his first voyage "nostre cousin le seigneur de Coucy et nostre amé et feal chevalier et premier chambellen Bureau sire de la Riviere, . . ." Froissart² refers to the first meeting as follows: "Si furent envoiet à Moustruel sus mer, dou costé des François, li sires de Couci, li sires de Rivière, messires Nicolas Brake et Nicolas³ le Mercier, . . ." The only discrepancy between the two accounts, it will be seen, consists merely in the occurrence of le Mercier's name in Froissart's list but not in the other. It should be further noted that the commissioners whom Froissart names as from the

¹ In seeking to discredit Froissart, Professor Manly invokes the authority of Siméon Luce to show that Froissart was "often mistaken both as to dates of important events and the persons concerned." We may, therefore, fairly appeal to the statement of this editor in settling the question raised by Professor Manly. Luce points out that Chaucer was not a member of the official deputation, but he doubts that Froissart is incorrect in naming the poet, and believes that among the records there must be some trace of Chaucer's mission. Significantly, Luce next states: "Nous apprenons précisément par un de ces articles qu'un paiement fut fait, le 17 février, à Geoffroi Chaucer qu'Édouard III avait chargé d'une mission en Flandre" (viii., cxxxix, n. 3). The French editor, moreover, is apparently drawing a distinction, which Manly ignores, between the official deputation and the confidential embassy entrusted to Chaucer.

² S. Luce, *Chron. de J. Froissart*, viii., 225-26.

³ Very likely an error for "Jean." In his introductory summary, Luce refers (viii., cxxxix) to this commissioner as 'Jean le Mercier,' whose name frequently occurs in the *mandements* in connection with these peace negotiations (Nos. 1374, 1411, 1413, 1490).

English side, Chaucer, Stury, d'Angle, are confirmed by the official records.

It is obviously necessary for Professor Manly to explain Froissart's statements; and this he undertakes to do by suggesting that Froissart really refers to the negotiations for the marriage of Richard and Marie's younger sister Isabel, which took place in 1378. In this Manly revives the earlier opinion of Nicolas which Skeat has already corrected.¹ But let us consider what this explanation would involve. If Froissart was actually referring to the negotiations of 1378, he not only committed a serious chronological error in dating the meetings a year too early, but he was also guilty of the incredible blunder of naming Marie instead of Isabel² as the princess concerned.

Finally, before impugning Froissart's testimony on the ground that it is not supported by other contemporary authority, one should bear in mind that Froissart was personally acquainted with Chaucer,³ and that quite possibly he may have been speaking from personal knowledge.

In this brief review, it is only possible to deal with the points which have been challenged by Professor Manly. For the positive arguments advanced in favour of my interpretation of the *Parlement of Foules*, anyone who is interested may refer to the text of my study.

HALDEEN BRADY.

[The above has been shown in proof to Professor Manly, who writes as follows:]

APPARENTLY in trying to make my comments (*R.E.S.*, x. 10-15) on Mr. Brady's study of *The Parlement of Foules* brief I did not make some of them entirely clear. I will now try to be clear as well as brief.

Mr. Brady regards the budget of January, 1377, recited in *Mandement* No. 1618, as applying to "a group" of the royal household. If this were true, Marie might of course be provided for with another group. The budget was, however, not for a group,

¹ Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, i, xxix ff. I have discussed the error of Nicolas at length in *Three Chaucer Studies*, No. II, pp. 20-22, 49-50.

² Less likely Katherine, who was not born until February 4, 1378.

³ G. L. Kittredge, *Englische Studien*, xxvi (1899), 321-36. See also F. S. Shears, *Froissart, Chronicler and Poet*, p. 19.

but—as is abundantly clear from the document itself—for the whole royal family for the year 1377.

Mr. Braddy argues that Marie's name may have been omitted from the recital of the original budget of January, 1377, because her death had occurred "during the year which had elapsed since the original order was issued." But if Marie did not die until May, 1377, as Mr. Braddy contends, she would at least have been in the family budget for four months. Now, when Henri de Bar was added to the royal household (*Mandement* No. 1218, dated Paris 3 mars 1375), the budget of January, 1374, was recited in full and 100 *francs d'or* added to the 1,900 per month provided in that budget. It would seem, therefore, that if any change in the household had occurred during the year 1377, the budget would have been recited in its original form and the change indicated.

The omission of Marie from the list of children when various purchases were made would of course have no significance if it did not confirm the inference from her omission from the budget. Mr. Braddy thinks, however, that the existence of records showing some purchases for Marie for the Christmas season 1376 proves that she was alive then. But the dates of the records are dates when payments were made, not when purchases were ordered.¹ If Marie died while the purchases for Christmas were being made, we should expect that she would be included in some purchases and not in others.

If I had argued that the omission of Marie's name from a single purchase proved her death, Mr. Braddy might be justified in trying to force upon me the absurdity of placing her death before "March 25, 1375."² The *Mandement* he cites, however, does not seem to me "similar in every respect to" those recording purchases for all the children. If one supplies the words omitted by Mr. Braddy, one finds that it merely records payments for New Year's gifts from Charles the Dauphin to Charles de Lebre, from Loys to Loys de Lebre, and from the King to his daughter Ysabel, to

¹ Mr. Braddy infers that Marie was still alive on January 24, 1377, because Charles paid on that date for *pelletierie* delivered at some unknown date to *notre vallet pelletier*.

² In addition to the documents of June, 1375, concerning the contract of marriage between Marie and William of Hainault, Mr. Braddy might have cited the letter of Charles V, dated September 17, swearing, as Albert and William had done, to carry out the contract (Devillers, *Cartulaire*, ii., 247 f., No. DLVI). Further, the civil year in France did not begin on March 25, but at Easter; in both countries, however, *le premier jour de l'an* meant January 1.

George de la Bausme, to a chevalier of Aragon, and to the son of the Count d'Armagnac.

Mr. Braddy cites three instances of prompt payment as evidence that the bill for Marie's *poille* would have been paid promptly; but Dyne Rapond was paid on February 4 for satin furnished October 7 (No. 1330) and Denisot Homo's bill for hats ran from March 25, 1375, to December 30, 1376 (No. 1304).

So much for the evidence that Marie died before January 1, 1377. This conclusion is, of course, not certain, but it is suggested by the available records. However, as I indicated originally, the case against Mr. Braddy's theory does not depend upon this.

Mr. Braddy seems not to have understood my rejection of Froissart's statements. Not only have I never denied that Chaucer, Percy, Stury, and d'Angle were sent abroad in February, 1377, on secret business for the King, but I have published more evidence of this than was previously known. Froissart says they made a secret treaty for the marriage of Richard and Marie, but he is not supported by any contemporary evidence, official or unofficial, and the various redactions of his chronicle differ so much in detail that his information certainly came from no authoritative source.

Mr. Braddy says I make much of the fact that he quotes now from one edition of Froissart and now from another. He misses my point. I spoke of redactions, not of modern editions. For his first quotation he used Froissart's second redaction because the first contains no mention of a marriage discussion in 1376; for his second he used Froissart's first redaction because the second makes clear that the subject of the secret treaty was not the marriage but merely "pour leur partie à estre à Montreuil." The text of Froissart's three redactions of these episodes (they do not appear in the MS. of Rome) can be found in Kervyn de Lettenhove's edition, vols. viii. and xvii.; anyone who wishes to form an opinion on Froissart's authority should read and compare them. It is true that in all three he asserts that marriage was discussed and that Chaucer was one of the envoys; but in the second and third redactions marriage negotiations were begun in 1376 by the official ambassadors, in the first they were begun in Lent, not by the ambassadors, but by the special envoys, d'Angle, Stury, and Chaucer; in the first redaction, but not in the second and third, the marriage is discussed at the May-June meeting; in the first redaction the French offer of twelve cities and demand that Calais

be dismantled (which probably belong to a later period) are made at the May-June meeting, in the second redaction at the February-March meeting, in the third at the first meeting. Finally, although so much is made of discussions of the marriage (in the third redaction Marie has become merely "la fille du roy de Franche"), none of the redactions knows anything of the death of Marie, which in the circumstances ought to have been important enough to mention; indeed the only notice of the death of Marie in any of the MSS. of Froissart seems to be that in the MS. of Soubise, which after recording the obsequies of Edward III by Charles V concludes: "Assez tost après trespassa madame Marie, ainsnée fille dou roy de France, laquelle estoit jurée et convenancée au damoiseil Guillaume de Haynault, fils ainsé dou duc Aubert" (Kervyn, viii. 398).

The probable explanation of the whole matter is that some years after the events a confused story reached Froissart,¹ in which the peace negotiations of 1377 and the peace and marriage negotiations of 1378 were blended and the name of Marie was introduced because apparently the date of her death was not known. It is noteworthy that Froissart knows nothing of negotiations in the spring of 1378; Mr. Braddy denies that there were any, but the long letter of the papal envoys (cf. *R.E.S.*, x. 13, n. 3) proves that there were.²

In his new article Mr. Braddy triumphantly refutes this theory of confusion by saying: "If Froissart was actually referring to the negotiations of 1378, he not only committed a serious chronological error in dating the meetings a year too early, but he was also guilty of the incredible blunder of naming Marie instead of Isabel as the princess concerned." But Froissart was capable of just such incredible blunders. He says that there were conferences between the dukes of Lancaster, Brittany, Anjou, and Burgundy at Bruges in November, 1375, and that Louis of Flanders and the Duke of Burgundy held a tournament in honour of the other three at Ghent; Luce says that the dukes were neither at Bruges nor at Ghent at this time and that the tournament was held at Bruges early in April (Luce, viii., p. cxxxiv, n. 8). Froissart credits Bertrand du

¹ Surely Mr. Braddy does not mean to suggest, as he seems to do in his last page, that Froissart got the story from Chaucer? When and where did they meet between Froissart's removal from England in 1368 and his return in 1394?

² It is true that Mr. Braddy discussed Nicolas's view—practically the same as this—in his original study, pp. 20-22, 49-50, but he hardly presents the view fairly and some of his arguments are mere assumptions.

Guesclin with the expulsion of the English from Saint-Sauveur-le Vicomte; but Bertrand had little or nothing to do with it (*ibid.*, pp. cxix, n. 1; cxxii, n. 2; cxxviii, n. 1). Froissart represents Charles of Navarre as preparing to marry Eleanor of Castile in 1378; but he had already married her on May 27, 1375 (ed. Raynaud, ix., p. xxxviii, n. 3). Not to prolong the agony, Froissart assigns as the cause of the death of the Queen of France what was really the cause of the death of the Queen of Navarre which occurred in November, 1373, and not, as he reports, after that of the Queen of France in February, 1378 (*ibid.*, ix., pp. xxxiii, n. 1, and xxxiv, n. 1).¹

Meanwhile let us not forget that the record of the gift made to Chaucer on March 6, 1381 (*Life Records*, No. 143), specifically distinguishes between his negotiations for *peace* in the reign of Edward III and those for *marriage* in that of Richard II.

Neither here nor in my first article have I discussed what Mr. Braddy calls his "positive arguments." This was due partly to lack of space, for I have studied them carefully. But they all seem so unconvincing that they may well be left without formal discussion; the ideas, for example, that literary convention obliged Chaucer to supply a third suitor, and that the tone and substance of the bird parliament would have appealed to the Lancastrian party as effective satire of the parliament of 1376 are to me, frankly, absurd; and I find it difficult to remain serious when I try to see in Richard, who according to Walsingham was knighted on April 23—only a few days at most before the writing of the poem—the tercel who was

. . . the worthiest
Of knighthode, and lengest hath used hit.

If the poem were really written when Mr. Braddy thinks it was, I can conceive of no purpose or aim for it except to soothe the wounded vanity of Baby Marie when upon returning to London Chaucer found that the English Government would have nothing to do with the marriage arranged by him and his colleagues, but, like the French, were actively preparing for war. But if so, why didn't he write in her language?

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.

¹ Scores of equally serious errors are noted by Luce and Raynaud in their edition of Froissart. I originally thought a mere reference to Luce would suffice.

REVIEWS

Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry. By DOUGLAS BUSH. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Pp. viii+360. \$4; 18s.

THIS is a remarkable book. Mr. Bush has read widely, has drawn from many sources, knows the work of other critics, writes entertainingly, and is not afraid to be witty. His aim is to describe the uses of classical mythology in English non-dramatic poetry from the Middle Ages to 1680. He hopes to complete the tale in another volume. The importance of the subject is thus affirmed in his Introduction: "In spite of the vast bulk of Arthurian stuff, old and new, we can imagine a world without Arthur; we can hardly conceive of a world without Apollo." Mr. Bush's abundant materials are so ordered as to show the changing ways in which successive ages treated this mythology and the attitude towards it of the chief English poets. This will be seen by the headings to some of his fifteen chapters. Besides such general divisions as "Classical Themes in the Middle Ages," "Myths in earlier Elizabethan verse," "Translators," "Allegory and Anti-pagan sentiments in the Seventeenth Century," we have "Ovid Old and New," "Spenser," "Marlowe: *Hero and Leander*," "Shakespeare: *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*," "Chapman," "Milton." As for the relation between mediæval or later English poets and the Greek and Latin writers who were their ultimate authorities for the facts of Mythology, two things are emphasized again and again in the book. The first, and one perhaps not yet generally recognized, is that direct indebtedness to a classic was exceptional. We are prepared for this in pre-renaissance times when the place of Homer was taken by Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius, but it is probably a shock to many to learn that after all the chief Greek and Latin classics were to be had in print, modern authors were largely indebted to handbooks such as that by Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*. An amusing example of

this is given on p. 200, where Mr. Bush prints the first paragraph of a dedication by Chapman and points out that, as shown by M. Schoell, the allusions and their significance were taken from N. Comes. Mr. Bush is far franker in his acknowledgements, writing on the same page "Grasping our golden bough, which will prove to be M. Schoell, we plunge into the shadows." But Comes was not the only later source; Boccaccio's *De genealogia deorum*, Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, and many others amply proved their usefulness, just as Erasmus's *Adagia* and Caelius Rhodiginus's *Lectiones Antiquæ* were behind much of the erudition of the seventeenth-century prose writers. The second fact was that not only did the tales of ancient Greece filter down to the poets by many devious ways, but that on their journey and on their arrival they were contaminated in different ways, by moralizations, allegorizations, by romantic perversions and additions, by the humour of the individual author. Thus the original character of the mythological figure, the outline of the classical legend, reappeared in surprising shapes. Mr. Bush does not spend many pages on the Mediæval period. He shows that the Homeric stories which were got at second hand were now blended with romantic love, briefly describes the popularity of Vergil and the *Ars Amatoria* and *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, and sums up in the words "Allegory might almost be said to constitute the bone, muscle, and nerves of serious medieval literature." Of Chaucer and Gower, we are told that "while, except in a few moments of pathos, classic myths left Chaucer cold, they found in Gower an often spirited and sympathetic narrator," but Gower, though "his knowledge of the Latin classics was considerable," could make two persons of "Tullius" and "Cithero." Well, in Dr. William Smith's Bible Dictionary, a contributor did the same with Jerome and Hieronymus—and escaped editorial correction.

The division on "Ovid old and new" deals first with the allegorical interpretations which prevailed for many centuries; but gradually he did by degrees "slough off his didactic and allegorical skin sufficiently to emerge as something more like the poet we know." "His combination of brilliant rhetoric and soulless subject matter was exactly suited to the renaissance taste." His influence here was great both direct and indirect. In connexion with Ovid, the curious fact might have been mentioned that when his *Metamorphoses* were first known to mediæval Wales in a Welsh dress, he came, in the form *Ofydd*, to mean a poet, as Professor W. J. Gruffydd

shows, in an article referred to by Professor D. A. Slater in a school edition of *Stories from the Metamorphoses*. By far the longest chapters in the book are the fifth, on Spenser, and the fourteenth, on Milton. In these, at times, the reader may seem to be facing a general description of the poets' qualities rather than their methods of using mythology, but Mr. Bush is careful to arrest our attention at intervals by such remarks as "Spenser's works are an endless gallery of mythological paintings," "the main theme of this book, the way in which medieval and modern elements are mingled in one current of poetical expression, is nowhere better illustrated than in Spenser." But Spenser's immediate acquaintance with the classics is represented as small. It has been shown that "direct Greek influence on *The Shepheardes Calender*, if it existed at all, was negligible," and that his chief models were Marot and the poets of the Pléiade, together with Chaucer and Mantuan, and that even Vergil's influence seems to have been "slight, indirect, and distorted." It is pointed out that the estimate of Spenser's direct debt to classical, especially Greek, literature has been shrinking, while that of his debt to mediæval and renaissance literature has risen. It can hardly be proved that he made more than the slightest use of Homer. As Mr. Bush writes, "When ancient Latin or modern sources account for Spenser's material and his modern coloring, it seems best to leave Homer in the background," and "however much or little Spenser knew of the Homeric poems, he regularly alters the spirit of what he borrows, and as far as these items are concerned he needed no more of Homer than he could find, translated and moralized, in Comes and other higher critics." Of Spenser's indebtedness to Vergil, Mr. Bush speaks with coldness as mainly external, "what he takes he greatly alters, in important matters seldom happily." He leaves the question as insoluble how much the poet's high seriousness owes directly to Vergil. He is careful to point out elsewhere that quite apart from recognizable pieces of indebtedness a renaissance poet may have been influenced by the standard of a classic. With Ovid and especially the *Metamorphoses*, Spenser is more at home. His special fondness for the poem is proved by his inventing myths on the Ovidian pattern. But whatever classical sources Spenser may have employed, *The Faerie Queene*, we are told, "owes most of its material and more than a little of its narrative technique to medieval romance." Attention is drawn to the Celtic element in Spenser. "For him

the boundaries between the world of classic myth and Celtic other-world dissolve." Lest this imperfect summary should give the impression that Mr. Bush disparages Spenser, let me conclude it with his words: "Spenser without the classics would be different, but his main outlines would be little changed; Spenser without medieval and modern literature would be inconceivable."

In his chapter on Milton Mr. Bush begins by saying that from the first he "moved in the main stream of Renaissance humanism and remained closer to Spenser than to any other single poet," adding, however, that this statement is only comparative, and applies to his ethical thought more than to his poetical expression. His knowledge of ancient literature is emphasized: "He drank copiously from the sources which Spenser with a few exceptions only sipped, and from many sources that Spenser did not know." True to the Renaissance tradition is his fondness for Ovid. But Mr. Bush points out that, owing to Milton's freedom of handling and fusing of many sources, distinct echoes of Ovid seldom appear, especially in his early poems. After commenting on his Latin verse, Mr. Bush suggests that Milton carried over into English the style and conventions of Latin verse, and that this gave his English the quality of artifice and rhetorical rotundity. It is not easy to describe the contents of the next pages. Mr. Bush attempts by an examination of Milton's poems in chronological order to trace his poetic evolution, "the continuance in his early work of the renaissance manner, and the emergence of a more classical style of his own," the changes being mirrored in his treatment of mythology. A series of passages are taken and discussed in turn. All this demands and deserves the reader's closest attention. So much is quoted in text and notes of the views of other critics that it becomes hard reading.

A less important topic, in Chapter XV, is "Travesties of Classical Themes and Poems." Here we learn that though Scarron set a fashion, yet there were earlier attempts in England. The Rev. James Smith's *The Innovation of Penelope and Ulysses*, printed in *Wit Restored*, 1658, was apparently written in, or before 1640. Though drama forms no part of his subject. Mr. Bush cannot help mentioning the burlesque puppet-play of Hero and Leander in *Bartholomew Fair*, comparing it with the Pyramus and Thisbe of the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. In the "Conclusion" the pause at 1680 is justified: the line must be drawn between Milton and Dryden. "For the substance of Milton's mind is largely a

combination of Renaissance humanism and medievalism ; there is no such mixture in the writings of Dryden and his fellows." Finally, Mr. Bush observes " Mythology in English poetry has often been a blessing, often too a curse, but always it has been, so to speak, an accident. It belongs, to vary a phrase of Denham's, to the clothes, not the garb of the ancients. Perhaps, however much native or romantic coloring it acquires, mythology in English poetry always remains an exotic. Yet, for those who, surveying poetry of the past or present, regard it only as a curse, it is well to pause and consider how infinitely poorer that great body of poetry would be without it."

There is perhaps a danger at times of Mr. Bush being overwhelmed by the mass of his materials, but he fights his way through by the aid of a sprightly style, enlivened by appropriate reminiscences of Charles Dickens (Mr. Weller's commendation of Sam's Valentine for containing " no Wenuses nor nothin' o' that kind " was inevitable), W. S. Gilbert, Mr. Wells, Mr. Chesterton and others. But a protest may be entered against the supposition that Tennyson wrote " sound forever of imperial Rome." Tennyson gave the second word after the manner of " our rude forefathers."

E. BENSLY.

An Introduction to Tudor Drama. By F. S. BOAS. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1933. Pp. viii + 176. 4s. 6d. net.

THERE is an amazing amount of expert knowledge contained in this little book, which will probably be found almost too useful by those preparing for University Finals. It is, however, unfortunate that the arrangement of the book has precluded apparently a list of authorities. Dr. Boas deals with many questions still highly controversial, and in the limited space at his disposal it is naturally quite impossible to do more than indicate his own conclusions with the more salient circumstances which have guided his judgments. That being so, some indication might have been given of the books where these questions are discussed at length. For example, Dr. Boas considers—probably with justice—that the claim made by Dr. Wallace for Cornyshe as the founder of the English Drama is untenable, but he does not mention Dr. Wallace's book where the claim is set forth.

Again it is a serious omission from a survey of Tudor Drama, and particularly of early Tudor Drama, that there is no chapter on the Morality or Interlude. Sir Edmund Chambers gives a list of forty-five falling within the period, of which he holds eighteen were written in Elizabeth's reign. They are therefore from mere bulk important. A few of them are alluded to in the text, but except in the case of those attributed to Heywood, the references are slight and merely incidental. For example, *Lusty Juventus* is only named because it appears in the play of *Sir Thomas More*. But one of the most interesting questions in the history of the drama of this period is the influence of such interludes on the development of the plots and main characters in the great Elizabethan plays. *Lusty Juventus* with his gaiety and his disreputable companions is a prototype of Prince Hal.

The discussion in chapter viii on the relation of *The Famous Victories* to Shakespeare's Henry V TrilogY suffers from these two omissions, and from too great compression generally. Dr. Boas says that *The Famous Victories* "furnished material" to Shakespeare, and in particular that it "foreshadows" the situation and dialogue in the crown scene in *Henry IV*. Mr. A. E. Morgan's work on *Henry IV* makes it far more likely that Shakespeare's trilogy and the *Famous Victories* are descended from a common original, and that the lines which Dr. Boas quotes are not a source of the parallel scene in Shakespeare, but a bungled reminiscence of that scene. Dr. Boas quotes:

God bless thee and make thee his servant
And send thee a prosperous reign;
For God knows, my son, how hardly I came by it.

The last line is clearly due to Shakespeare's

God knows, my son
By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways
I met the crown.

The "it" in the last line of the passage from *The Famous Victories* must be the crown: no one could say "how hardly I came by the reign."

Again Nathaniel Woodes' *Conflict of Conscience* is not named, and however bad a play it may be, its relation to Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* is so clear and so interesting that even a short book can hardly afford to omit it. The reviewer has felt for many years

that this relation opens the question whether *Faustus* was not in some form Marlowe's earliest play written while he was still at Cambridge. Woodes calls himself Minister of Norwich. There was apparently close intercourse between Norwich and Cambridge. Both Woodes and Marlowe appear to be writing within a folk-play formula.

Finally, it may be suggested that Dr. Boas is a little severe in his judgments of both Peele and Munday. Neither produces any single completely satisfactory work, but Peele has a bubbling spring of poetry and both show "invention" in the striking out of new forms. It is characteristic of Dr. Boas's pregnant style that he indicates in a parenthesis of two or three words his finding against the pretensions of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* to be the inspiration of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. This packed, allusive, and yet eminently simple style makes the book most stimulating reading.

J. SPENS.

The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse. Chosen by E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1932. Pp. xiv + 905. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS is an excellent piece of work. I do not know of a better *period* (as distinct from *subject*) anthology. Here is represented, in generous and faithful epitome, the whole achievement (excluding drama) of sixteenth-century English poetry. It begins with *The Nutbrown Maid*, and with Hawes and More and Skelton; and takes in Shakespeare, Daniel, Raleigh and Campion, with part of Drayton and Chapman, excluding Jonson and Donne; actually finishing with a late group of anonymous poems, such as *Phillida flouts me* (I confess I unreasonably prefer "Phillada"), the last of all being a lovely poem, which will be new to most readers, from a MS. at Harvard, said to have been found among Milton's papers. No one is likely to quarrel with these boundaries. Within them, Sir Edmund has put together a collection that to any lover of literature must be, not a handful, but a whole trainload of pleasant delights; to the student, a manual more illuminating than any critical or historical disquisition could ever be; and even to a scholar whose erudition might match Sir Edmund's, a probably invaluable, and

at least eminently convenient, repertory of reliable and interesting texts drawn from all sorts of printed and manuscript sources (including *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1812). The Sackville MS. in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge (described by Miss Hearsey in *R.E.S.*, VIII, no. 31), was discovered too late to be used by Sir Edmund for his text of the *Induction* (nothing comes out more clearly in the anthology than the sudden emergence of the grand style with Sackville). Throughout, "spelling, capitalization and punctuation have been systematically modernized." Extracts have occasionally been given from long poems, on the whole very judiciously excised. But several quite long poems are printed *in extenso*: such as, besides Sackville's *Induction* (76 stanzas), the delightful *Orchestra* (with the earlier ending, which makes the poem complete, though it involves the loss of what is, perhaps, Davies's best stanza), and, what we should be specially grateful for, Raleigh's *Cynthia* poem from the Cecil MS. 144, apparently given as fully as the rough draught allows. The notes are sparing, but full of stuff. I cannot imagine why Davies's note before the new stanzas at the end of the 1622 *Orchestra* ("Here are wanting some Stanzas describing Queen Elizabeth") should be called "unintelligible." Take them as they stand, without reference to 1596, and nothing could be more intelligible. There is no note on "Come unto these yellow sands," though the orthodox arrangement here printed violates the metrical pattern clearly indicated in the folio.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE.

The Plays of John Marston. In Three Volumes. Vol. I.

Edited from the Earliest Texts with Introduction and Notes.

By H. HARVEY WOOD. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1934.

Pp. xliv+246. 8s. 6d. net each volume.

THIS volume, the first of a three volume edition of Marston's plays, is also the first of a projected series, *The Blackfriars Dramatists*. According to the publishers' announcement, "The difficulty of obtaining accurate and inexpensive texts of many of the Elizabethan dramatists has suggested . . . the desirability of such a series . . . to include such writers as Tourneur, Ford, Middleton, Shirley, etc."

The text of three of Marston's plays (*Antonio and Mellida*,

Antonio's Revenge, The Malcontent) is given in this first volume, with an Introduction, a few textual footnotes, and in all some twenty-seven pages of end notes, mainly explanatory. The thirty-page Introduction is in three parts: a Life (16 pp.), a critical survey of the plays (9 pp.), and bibliographical notes (4 pp.) on the three plays reprinted.

For his life of Marston, Mr. Wood has followed Bullen, and has made use of recently published material—usually but not always with adequate acknowledgment—but he has not covered all the ground, or thoroughly what he has covered. If he had followed carefully Sir Edmund Chambers's brief life (*Elizabethan Stage*, iii, 427-9), his narrative would have been better constructed and more accurate on several points. Mr. Wood has apparently not seen my brief life of Marston (*Abstracts of Dissertations for D. Phil. Oxon.*, Vol. I, 1928, pp. 23-31—referred to in *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 26, 1931, p. 233), which would have filled in some of the gaps and suggested a different arrangement of material. He makes no mention of the assumptions on which a life of Marston is built and does not make clear the two periods of Marston's career as a dramatist. He makes no reference anywhere to Marston's special concern with the Children of the Queen's Revels (or Blackfriars) in which company and in its profits and properties Marston held a one-sixth interest. His arrangement of matter seems unnecessarily "jumpy" when he deals with Marston's literary career after the time of the satires. He first mentions the Clifton letter (to be dated in 1607), then an entry in Henslowe's *Diary* under 1599, the plays *Antonio and Mellida, Antonio's Revenge, The Malcontent* (1604), before returning to the stage quarrel of Marston and Jonson, 1598-1601, which is dealt with mainly in a footnote. The stage quarrel brings in *What You Will* and more about the relations of Jonson and Marston from 1601 to 1605 (*Eastward Ho*). The plays printed in 1605 and 1606 are next briefly discussed and then *What You Will* again, since it was printed in 1607, before mention is made of Marston's entry into the Church. *Histriomastix* and *Jack Drum*, with their references to the stage quarrel, are next mentioned before *The Insatiate Countess*, which was probably left unfinished by Marston, and so the narrative passes to Marston's ordination, marriage, and death.

I note the following points:

P. xxi. Mr. Grattan Flood's note on Marston's Clifton Letter

appeared in *R.E.S.*, iv. 86-87, not 212 as Mr. Wood states. And I must deny Mr. Wood's statement that I replied to Marston's letter!¹ Mr. Wood adopts my dating of the letter, and the references here used so impressively seem to have been "lifted" from my note—as does an earlier reference (p. xviii) to Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses* from another article of mine—for Mr. Wood nowhere shows that he has gone beyond his most immediate sources for details of Marston's life.

P. xxii. Small's conjecture (*Stage Quarrel*, pp. 90-91) about the "Maxton" entry in Henslowe's *Diary*—that Marston was the "other Jentellman" mentioned by Henslowe as collaborating with Jonson, Dekker, and Chettle on *Robert II, King of Scots*, a tragedy—ought to have been mentioned.

P. xxv. The passage quoted from the Drummond *Conversations* includes the crux—"that Marston represented him jn the stage jn his youth given to Venerie"—which is allowed to stand without any comment. Apparently Mr. Wood used Herford and Simpson's edition of the *Conversations*, where the reasons for a fresh paragraph division after "stage" and for Penniman's emending of the punctuation are referred to at i, 131.

The *Eastward Ho* affair is most inadequately summarized.

Pp. xxvii and xxviii. The indebtedness for information used here about Marston's ordinations and his supplication to read in the Bodleian cries aloud to be acknowledged. (*M. L. R.* xxii, 11-13.)

P. xxvii. The first edition of *Jack Drum's Entertainment* came out in 1601, not 1616, and the play was probably Marston's first to appear in print, although anonymously. There is little doubt now that Marston was responsible for the whole of the play, and there is almost contemporary manuscript evidence of his authorship, of which Mr. Wood is apparently not aware. Mr. Wood passes very quickly over the question of Marston's share in *Histrionastix*.

P. xxviii. Mr. Wood writes of "some copies" of *The Insatiate Countess*, 1631, with Marston's name in the title-page replaced by that of William Barkstead. Only one such title-page is at present known. (See my article in *The Library*, viii, 342.)

¹ "The letter, which had been previously noticed by Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage*, iii, 429), and Greg (*English Literary Autographs*, Part I, s. 18) was replied to in the same review (p. 212) by Mr. R. E. Brettie, who attempts to discover the exact date and occasion of the letter." (Another example of clumsy writing occurs at the top of p. xxv.)

I have noted the following misprints: p. xxiv, n. 3, "unprobable"; p. xxix, "Shearer" for "Sheares."

The critical section on the plays (pp. xxxi-xxxix) raises questions which are matters more of taste than of fact. Mr. Wood has no unusual or startling re-estimate of Marston to give. He seems to follow Swinburne and Bullen, and uses perhaps a hint or two from Mr. T. S. Eliot. He refers to the affectations of Marston's style and to his "congested, tortuous obscurity," but he does not give Marston credit for his power of writing simply, clearly, and forcefully, with a colloquial ease that is not overweighted with thought. It is just this clear fluency without philosophic depth that is Marston's outstanding characteristic. Mr. Wood does refer, quite justly as it seems, to the satiric emphasis in the plays, to Marston's moral preoccupations, and to the question whether Marston's "sardonic rage" and "moral indignation" were merely "the cloak for a prurient and perverted interest in the vices he chastised." He concludes from the accent of sincerity and conviction of Marston's satirical mouthpieces that Marston was not following a satiric fashion but "was deeply and sincerely interested in the vices and corruptions of his age." He considers it unwise to probe farther, and thus shirks the central difficulty of the "mixture of the elements" in Marston, the mixture of high ideals and a strong Calvinistic conscience with a real or imagined sinner's acquaintance with vice. Mr. Wood points out the positive virtues of Marston's style: his almost metaphysical heat and vigour, his powers of description, and the "dignified exalted rhetoric spoken by so many of his characters." *The Dutch Courtesan* is considered to be "Marston's best solo work in comedy," but little attention is given to it. *The Malcontent* is praised as "one of the most original plays of its period," but the student of Marston may find difficulty in agreeing about its "excellence of construction"—preferring to describe it as a tortuous rambling melodrama—or about the "easy, natural, graceful humour" of "the passage of wit between Pietro and the singing boy" (III, iv)—which is obviously factitious and irrelevant.

It would have been better if Marston's maturer plays in the different kinds—*The Fawn*, *The Dutch Courtesan*, *Sophonisba*, and Marston's share in *Eastwood Ho*—had been considered more fully.

But the main aim of this first volume of Mr. Wood's edition is not so much a brief biography and critical survey—although these should have been given carefully and adequately—as an accurate

reprint of three of Marston's plays. The text of the two *Antonio and Mellida* plays is said to be "a reprint of the quarto issue of 1602," with such variant readings "from the 1633 collection" as seemed important, and conjectural emendations by Bullen and Deighton. Mr. Wood has been sparing with his own conjectures, preferring "the corruptions of 1602 to original corruptions" of his own. The text of *The Malcontent*, similarly treated, "is based on two copies of the unaugmented state (British Museum, Bks. 2, b. 11—a rotograph copy of Dyce, 6250: and C.39. c. 25), collated with, and additions supplied from, the third edition (British Museum, C.34. e. 17), from which, too, the text of the Epistle and Induction are taken." Mr. Wood has used apparently the B.M. copy of the second edition as his "original," adopting what seemed to him better and fuller readings from copies of the first and third editions. His unfamiliarity with the technical terms of bibliography will have been noticed already; the quality of his bibliographical equipment may be gauged from the sentence: "*The Malcontent* exists in three states, represented by different quartos, all from the same publisher, and bearing the same date"—where he means, or should mean, that copies of *The Malcontent* are to be found belonging to three editions. Incidentally, copies of the first edition show two different states of the text on B 1 verso. (By the way, in his preface, Mr. Wood describes the frontispiece as "from the title-page of the apparently unrecorded quarto of *Sophonisba*, which I discovered in the National Library of Scotland." If he means that that particular quarto volume was unrecorded, I have to point out that it was described in the old *Catalogue of the Advocates' Library* (1876, Vol. 3). If he means that that particular quarto volume is a copy of an "apparently unrecorded" edition of *Sophonisba*, I have to point out that it is not a copy of an unrecorded edition of *Sophonisba*, but a copy of a recorded edition with only a hitherto unrecorded variant title-page.)

And now to sample Mr. Wood's handling of the text. (For purposes of comparison, I use (a) for *Antonio and Mellida*, photostats of B.M. 11773. c. 5, collated with B.M. 643. c. 78, Dyce 6248 and Bodl. Mal. 252 (1); (b) for *Antonio's Revenge*, photostats of B.M. C. 21. b. 40 (4), collated with Dyce 6249 and Bodl. Mal. 252 (2); and (c) for *The Malcontent*, photostats of B.M. C.12. g. 8 (2), a copy of the third edition, collated with Bodl. Mal. 252 (4), 195 (5), B.M. C.34. e. 17, the two Dyce copies 6251—all of the third edition

—B.M. C.39. c. 25 of the second edition, and Dyce 6250 and Bodl. Mal. 252 (3) of the first edition. In general the plan to follow the old spelling—although with u's for v's and j's for i's in the appropriate places, and short instead of long s's—has been carefully observed; but the same care has not been used in keeping to the original punctuation. Many variations have been allowed to creep in together with some injudicious attempts at emendation. The punctuation of the 1602 editions of the *Antonio and Mellida* plays showed some unusual difficulties—badly cast or blurred commas and stops and a peculiar hyphen-like raised stop—but these difficulties hardly excuse such handling of the text as the following:

- | | | | |
|--------------|--|-----|---------|
| p. 6, l. 27. | Ladie's | for | Ladies |
| l. 28. | Tailor's | for | Tailors |
| p. 7, l. 6. | Piero's | for | Pieros |
| l. 16. | ("Ladies," in "a Ladies part," allowed to stand) | | |
| l. 24. | "a Ladies' prejudice" for "a Ladies preiudice." | | |

Commas are not only inserted but omitted or silently changed:

- | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| p. 109, l. 2. | <i>Maria</i> | for | <i>Maria</i> , |
| l. 10. | then, | for | then |
| p. 111, l. 5. | disguise, stand bolde, | for | disguise stand bolde. |

There are also quite a few variations in spelling:

- | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|--------|-------------|
| p. 52, l. 13. | somewhat | for | somwhat |
| p. 53, l. 2. | kind | for | kinde |
| l. 36. | loade | for | load |
| p. 87, l. 5. | (of Scena Secunda). | tainst | for taintst |

The text of *The Malcontent* raises other difficulties. Mr. Wood states that he has used the text of the second edition copy as his original, yet he gives Webster's Induction and Marston's augmentations, which only appear in the third edition, and prefers the third to the second edition version of Marston's address, To the Reader. It would surely have been preferable to use the text of copies of the third edition as "original," collating with copies of the first and second edition. My notes on the B.M. copy of the second edition are few, but they suggest that there is no certainty that Mr. Wood has followed the second edition carefully. If he had, or if he had looked at copies of the first edition, he would have printed "long dead"

for "long flead" (p. 173, l. 7) and "nicenes" for "nicences" (p. 204, l. 27) or at least have given a textual note. Since Mr. Wood is avowedly using the text of the second edition as his original, I have sampled the text of only those parts of the play that occur in the third edition—the Induction and the augmentations. The half-title to the Induction—The/Induction To/The Malecontent, And/the additions acted by the Kings Ma-/iesties servants./Written by John Webster./—is inexplicably omitted, although in conjunction with the title-page it is valuable evidence for Webster's share in the play. There is the same laxity with regard to punctuation :

p. 142, l. 32.	Patron,	for	Patron
(l. 33.	injonyes	for	inioynes)
l. 38.	No,	for	No
p. 149, l. 19.	world,	for	world
l. 25.	nay,	for	nay
l. 28.	<i>quelquechose,</i>	for	<i>quelquechose</i>
p. 150, l. 3.	daughter :	for	daughter.
l. 9.	salvation !	for	salvation.

And so one might take sample after sample. Mr. Wood has forgotten to asterisk one passage (p. 160, l. 21 to p. 162, l. 8), as occurring only in copies of the third edition, and in connection with this passage I note a few of the more significant departures from the original :

p. 161, l. 18.	<i>Flushing.</i>	for	<i>Flushing ;</i>
l. 23.	shoes	for	shooes
l. 30.	hele be	for	heelee lie
p. 162, l. 2.	fooles	for	foole

The explanatory notes are not copious, and they are more in the manner of Bullen than in the manner of Mr. F. L. Lucas's notes on Webster. In such an edition of Marston some explanations must obviously be given, but the text is the main thing and the notes as well as the Introduction must take a very subordinate place. Mr. Wood seems to have been uncertain of his method within his limits, his notes ranging from a single line to more than a page in length. The result is a certain unevenness and an impression of gaps and incompleteness, for there are many directions to outside sources of information, to the notes of Bullen and others, where summarized information might have been given with references.

In fact the whole aim, purpose, and performance of this first volume of an edition of Marston is uncertain, as is the whole scheme for the projected series (*The Blackfriars Dramatists*). Mr. Wood in his preface says that the "fashion of editing has changed since Bullen's time, and it may be thought desirable to have texts of the dramatists 'in the newest cut.'" It might be good to have an edition of Marston's plays closer to the early texts than either Bullen's or Halliwell's reprints, and attractively printed and bound for about one-third or one-quarter of the present cost of a Bullen set. But I am not convinced that Mr. Wood and his publishers have found the most appropriate "newest cut." Their edition seems to fall between two stools. It is neither full enough nor accurate enough—in Introduction, text, textual apparatus and explanatory notes—for the scholar and the specialist, and it is too expensive and "finicking" for the ordinary student and the general reader. The Introduction and end-notes are not complete enough in themselves, since the reader is directed time and again to outside sources for information which might have been given with references. And the edition when completed will not be a complete edition of Marston—plays, poems, satires, and occasional pieces—but only of Marston's plays, and apparently of not all those for which he was wholly or partly responsible. Bullen has not yet been superseded.

R. E. BRETTE.

An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces.

Edited by CLARA GEBERT. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1933. Pp. x+302. 12s. 6d. net.

MISS GEBERT has reprinted in this volume the dedication or the epistle to the reader of a hundred books, ranging in date from Tottell's *Miscellany* of 1557 to the Shakespeare First Folio of 1623. The selection has been made chiefly "for the light which these expressions of contemporary mood and fashion cannot but throw upon the authors, the publishers, and the patrons of Elizabethan books" and well fulfils its main purpose, although it is open to criticism in details.

The dedications and prefatory epistles are representative of all kinds of books and authors, and illustrate such typical developments

in the literary life of the age, as the increasing influence of the middle-class reading public, the growth of a class of professional authors and their progress towards economic freedom, with the consequent decline in the importance of the patron. The chronological arrangement makes it possible to trace the history of the dedication as a form of writing through several interesting phases, even though verse dedications are excluded from the plan of the work.

As a reflection of early Elizabethan literary life the anthology is hardly satisfactory. Only sixteen of the dedications and prefaces date from the first thirty years of Elizabeth's reign: the selection appears, in consequence, to underrate the importance of the patrons of the early period. There is, for instance, no dedication to the Earl of Leicester, whose munificence as a patron of all branches of literature was unrivalled until the days of Essex. Sir Francis Walsingham's well-known interest in schemes of colonial development caused several writers of books of voyages and discovery to seek his patronage, but none of their inscriptions to him is included.

In her introduction Miss Gebert sets forth clearly the characteristics of the authors' dedications and stationers' prefaces of the Elizabethan period, and analyses carefully the motives of those who wrote them. In relating this survey of her subject to contemporary developments in the profession of letters and in the book trade, Miss Gebert makes effective use of the researches of earlier investigators. There are a few slips on matters of fact, and it is scarcely reassuring when one finds *Englands Helicon* referred to, in the first paragraph of the introduction, as an anthology of quotations. *Englands Parnassus* was, of course, intended.

The treatment of the text leaves much to be desired. Only in the most general sense can the book be considered an accurate reprint of the original editions. The punctuation of many of the dedications is modernized, and the spelling is occasionally altered.

The notes are excessively brief; as regards both matter and style they fall short of the standard one has learned to expect in a work of this kind.

H. J. BYROM.

Elizabethan Love Conventions. By LU E. PEARSON. Berkeley: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. xii+365. \$3.50; 16s. net.

THE title of this volume is unfortunately too broad for the ground covered: Mrs. Pearson treats only of literary conventions of the day, such as Platonic and courtly love; and her title would seem to include also social conventions, some of them purely matters of etiquette, some of them financial, some of them, like the formal betrothal, based in Common and Canon Law. Within her limited scope she summarizes the well-known material with an amplitude of quotation, but hardly with due proportion. Although the book gives almost twenty pages to Spenser's *Amoretti*, which are based at least as much on biographical fact as on any literary convention, yet she barely mentions the *Four Hymnes*, in which Platonic love has been more discussed than perhaps in any other Elizabethan lyric; and her bibliography reflects this important omission.

Mrs. Pearson surveys the familiar background of mediæval courtly love as apparent in Chaucer and Petrarch, and of Platonic love as apparent in Ficino, Bembo, and Castiglione. About Elizabethan poets she presents such equally well-known facts as: Wyatt's rebellion against the injustice of love; Petrarchan idealization of love by Drummond, Constable, and the Earl of Stirling; "the Anacreontic current of pretty phrases about Cupid in a garden of flowers", as in the poems of Lodge, Fletcher, and Griffin; the literary exercises of such poets as Smith, Toft, Barnes, Percy, and Barnfield; Sidney's analysis of love and desire; Spenser's portrayal of the earthly as well as the "heavenly" love; Richard Linche's celebration of inconstancy; and Donne's unflinching revelation of human love.

Especially in treating of Shakespeare, one misses a portrayal of the actual realistic manners and conventions of the age; moreover, excellent openings are left for this material after such statements as: "the women in Shakespeare's plays are the heroines of the Renaissance," expressing deeply passionate love and reflecting independence; and "Shakespeare broke the bonds between Petrarchan and natural love" in *Romeo and Juliet* and in *The Merchant of Venice*. In the latter, Mrs. Pearson is unaware of Bassanio's mercenariness, for she describes the passion in his wooing as "rich, and strong, and beautiful"; she explains, furthermore, his acceptance of Antonio's

loan not as a result of depleted finances, but as an effort to receive graciously and thereby strengthen a friendship. Unconvincing is the assumption that since Elizabeth did much to make the Petrarchan exaltation of women the conventional attitude, "had Lady Arabella Stuart succeeded to the throne the story of English womanhood and English love poetry might have been very different."

NADINE PAGE.

English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750. By RICHMOND P. BOND. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933; London: Humphrey Milford, 1934. Pp. xiv + 484. 20s. net.

MR. BOND has put in a great deal of work collecting the material for this large and thickly stocked book. No one could wish for more titles, quotations, and references. He hopes, modestly, that there will prove to be "few large gaps . . . noticed by an observant reader" and one can be sure that his hope amounts almost to certainty.

The plan of the book is Essay followed by Register, the Essay presenting "the story of Augustan burlesque poetry," and the chronological Register providing a *résumé* of 211 poems with free quotation and critical remarks. The uses of this Register are various: among other things it amounts to an anthology of significant snatches from many forgotten poems. As a book of reference to minor poetry Mr. Bond's work will have high value.

Perhaps the mental adjustment necessary for compiling a register has cramped Mr. Bond's style for the purposes of the essay part of his book. One feels that the Essay (except its final chapter) is all but made on the same lines as the Register. It is true that what there is of "story" comes through: but it has to struggle from below heaps of titles and an unending undergrowth of footnotes. Mr. Bond, it seems, ought to have freed himself more in his Essay, he ought to have been briefer and more creative. He rightly wished to link his Register to his Essay, but the effect is that the two are chained.

The lack of creative freedom of judgment is most apparent in the critique of important poems, especially in the chapter on *The Rape of the Lock*, the one indubitable masterpiece out of the 211 items. Here Mr. Bond all but reminds one of the opening of Elwin

and Courthope's preface to the *Rape*, that simple copying up of the verdicts of all the critics, each signed at the end. We want to know what Mr. Bond thinks of all his extracts. What, for instance, is his opinion of the paragraph quoted from Elwin and Courthope on p. 84, the statement that it is "the justly diffused moral air" which keeps the poem from being trivial? The note to p. 86:

I do not relish the necessity of space that forces relegation to a footnote on [*sic*] such citations as: Gosse . . . Stephen . . . Cazamian . . . Elton . . .

this note symbolizes Mr. Bond's reverence for everything everybody has ever said. After all its critics—even after Hazlitt—*The Rape of the Lock* still invites fresh judgment. There is a time to send back the books to the shelves and to follow the muse's advice to Sidney.

One or two small points may be noticed. The importance of Waller in the history of mock-heroic poetry before Pope needs to be examined. Mr. William Kerr noted this importance in his *Restoration Verse*. On p. 362 of that anthology he observed that "Pope derives always from Waller rather than from Dryden; these poems [i.e. *St. James's Park* and *Triple Combat*] set the tune of *The Rape of the Lock*—there is nothing else as elegantly mock-heroic between that and them." Mr. Bond overlooks Waller. And perhaps he might have brought out more emphatically the value of Miltonic echo for burlesque purposes, a value hinted at by Somerville in the preface to *Hobbinol*. The Paradisal phrase, if one may call it that, was clearly a brilliant and immediate device for raising the low theme to incongruous dignity. As an addition to his section of Gay's *Shepherd's Week*, one might note that the prose preface seems to have been intended as a parody on the style of E. K. The 1714 edition of *The Rape of the Lock*, pedantically speaking, should not be taken as the standard text (v. p. 66, note 1). The 1717 quarto and folio have variant readings and add thirty new lines. Pope's final revisions appear in 1736 and, if Warburton can be trusted, 1751.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

Johnson's England : an Account of the Life and Manners of His Age. Edited by A. S. TURBERVILLE. Oxford : The Clarendon Press. 1933. Two volumes : pp. xxiv + 405 and x + 404. 42s. net.

THESE two beautiful volumes are acknowledgeable descendants of *Shakespeare's England*. The country they deal with is a larger and fuller England, but it and its hero are clearer figures to us, and the volumes themselves are smaller. The Contents reads largely the same as that of the two earlier volumes, but "Heraldry" and "Folklore and Superstition," for example, have given place to "Taste" and "The Newspaper." (One chapter heading that has been kept, "London and the Life of the Town," is now misleading when there has been added a separate chapter dealing with "Town-life in the Provinces.")

Johnson is obviously the most suitable man whose name could be chosen for the title-rôle of this kind of book. He lived in the last age when it was possible for a man to know so much about so many facets of the life of his country that he could become eponymous, and Johnson had the completest knowledge of books, of men, and of things. The sciences had not then really begun that differentiation and development that were soon to make it impossible for anyone to attain to the old omniscience. Then they were more or less within anyone's reach, and "any educated man with dextrous fingers could acquire without difficulty a sufficient command of the subject to experience the thrill of standing on the threshold of the unknown." As Dr. Holmyard points out in his exciting chapter on "Science, Mathematics, and Astronomy," perhaps half of the advances in science at that time were due to the "ingenious and inquiring amateur."

Johnson was an "ingenious and inquiring amateur" all his life, and not merely towards science. His large and general powers might with equal success have been determined to any of the professions, and these volumes show the kind of life he would have been in if he had entered the Church or read for the Bar. Politics are omitted from the work as from *Shakespeare's England*. All the chapters to be found here are equally necessary to complete the picture of Johnson's England, but they are necessarily unequal in value. Some of the subjects have been admirably contained in the convenient compass of single volumes. Thus, "London" and

"Sculpture" could with little difficulty be read elsewhere, but to do so one would have to go to books by the same authorities who contribute the chapters here, Mrs. George and Mrs. Esdaile. It is a pity, by the way, that a plate of Johnson's monument in St. Paul's has not been added, since the book is about Johnson and since his monument so convincingly illustrates Mrs. Esdaile's remarks. Other subjects included here have been dealt with in many other works: e.g. "Trade and Industry," "Agriculture and Rural Life," "Poverty, Crime and Philanthropy," but short accounts are not readily obtainable elsewhere. Only by piecing together scattered information can one get the equivalent of these chapters, and it is into this useful class that most of the chapters in these volumes fall. Professor Nichol Smith contributes the most important chapter, the only one that other secondary authorities do not cover. It describes the newspaper at that formative period in its history. Although individual circulation did not increase, nor production improve to any marked extent during the century, the newspaper was firmly established at the end of Johnson's life. The London newspaper was not short of matter or of readers during sessions of Parliament, but felt the change that the end of the session brought. The *Morning Chronicle* for July 15, 1788, has the notice: "The Publick may rest assured that every necessary attention shall be paid to render the Morning Chronicle as various, instructive and entertaining, during the recess of Parliament, as possible—and this the Printer conceives may be accomplished without dealing in scandal, or sacrificing at the shrine of frivolity, folly or impertinence." Editors (or Authors as they were often called) were no doubt handicapped by the inflexibility in the size of their papers, for a page could not be added or omitted when necessity arose, and they were sometimes unscrupulous in the way they kept things over from their busy period. Malone tells of an experience as late as 1802: "Here are a multitude of new literary adventurers, started on the 1st day of the new year [1803]. The Booksellers have set up a new Newspaper called the British Press, or Morn^e Literary Advertiser; to contain all their book advertisements, besides the usual Articles of a Morn^e Paper. It has arisen from the extreme ill treatment they rec^d from all the principal conductors of Newspapers; a most detestable crew! and I am heartily glad they are thus punished. You may judge of their manner of proceeding from the following circumstance. In April last, in order to push on the sale of the

remaining copies of my Dryden, I carried Advertisements to three principal papers : the Times, the Herald, & the Morn^g Chronicle ; and they were not inserted in any of them till the latter end of July, when the parl^t was risen, & the town emptied. One of these conceited gentlemen told me, ' book advertisements were *mere lumber* ' ; and then humm'd an opera air." It is interesting to note in connection with the country circulation of London papers that Baldwin's *Literary Journal* (one of this multitude of new literary adventures, and one on which Baldwin spent £1000 a year), when changing from fortnightly to monthly publication gave as one of the reasons the fact that country readers got the number published in the middle of the month only with great difficulty.

The volumes gain more than they lose by their multiple authorship. The various chapters have been perhaps rather too carefully made not to overlap, however. Thus one might reasonably expect to find a mention of the decline in the death rate under " Medicine " as well as under " Trade and Industry," and of the effects of the window tax under " Architecture " or " The Interior of the House " as well as under " Medicine." There is a good index, however, and one can quickly find what one wants. The writing is straightforward and satisfactory, though there are occasional sentences like this : " there swam into play-lovers' ken a new genre." Mr. Osbert Sitwell and Miss Margaret Barton, writing on " Taste," attain more complexity without sacrificing sense, but they too wander sometimes : " and already, in the purity of some Greek gallery on a very quiet evening, there could be heard, far away, a curious rolling murmur, as it might be of thunder or massed drums, over the horizon ; for the great Romantic Movement, of which the Revolution and Napoleon, Shelley and Byron and Beethoven, and the new Houses of Parliament, are merely so many different manifestations, was on its way." The limitations in time implied in the title are observed, but not mechanically ; only once is there pointless writing like this : " The death of Dr. Johnson, followed as it was nine years afterwards by that of John Hunter, marks no epoch in the history of English medicine." The bibliographies are useful, and incidentally show the large amount of work that has recently been done on the eighteenth century.

There are parts of the book that one may question. Dr. Williamson finishes an admirable survey of " Exploration and Discovery " with the conclusions : " . . . the contents and editing

of most of the collections [of books of travel] indicate that the interest was not purely historical, as with present-day readers of Hakluyt and Purchas, but that it was largely topical and inspired by the ambitions and rivalries of the moment. Eighteenth-century Englishmen studied exploration partly for its scientific appeal but chiefly in order to learn how to out-distance the French." It is difficult to see how eighteenth-century Englishmen could apply whatever knowledge they got in this way; the majority of readers surely read about exploration because it was interesting, particularly when similar discoveries were then being made; the few who might have applied the knowledge, *i.e.* the explorers, were not out to outdistance those of another nationality. Dr. Williamson himself quotes evidence to prove this: when war broke out during Cook's last expedition, the French minister of marine issued orders to his admirals "that Captain Cook shall be treated as the commander of a neutral and allied power, and that all captains of armed vessels who may meet that famous navigator shall make him acquainted with the King's order on this behalf."

Mr. Orwin, writing on "Agriculture and Rural Life," is apt to exaggerate. When Johnson wrote that agriculture produces "the only riches which we can call our own and of which we need not fear either deprivation or diminution" he surely did not show an "appreciation of the indestructible nature of the soil" that was "remarkable." There is a kernel of truth in Mr. Orwin's sentence about the eighteenth-century stock-breeders: "England has been the reservoir upon which the settlers of all the new countries of the world have drawn for cattle and sheep with which to stock them, and the success of English breeders in meeting this demand, and in enabling this country to build up the gigantic edifice of exchange of manufactured goods for food and the raw materials of industry upon which her national existence depends, may be said to have had its origin in the genius of these pioneers."

There are various mistakes. Two different dates are given for the opening of the Bath theatre (i. 213 and 214). When Johnson visited Bath in 1776 the elder Palmer was not "dead and gone," and the younger Palmer "with his celebrated mailcoaches" was not "in the height of his glory" (i. 213-14). The influence attributed to the translation of Attiret's account of the Chinese pleasure-gardens must be postponed nine years, since the translation appeared in 1752, not 1743 (ii. 35). The Foundling Hospital

was opened in 1745, not in 1739 (ii. 48). Zoffany's picture (facing i. 347) is described as "Mr. and Mrs. Thrale entertaining Dr. Johnson to tea at Richmond," but it really shows Mr. and Mrs. Garrick entertaining Mr. Bowden. (See L. F. Powell's edition of Boswell, iv. 454-55). Otherwise the plates, of which there are 160, are one of the most valuable parts of the book.

Johnson's England adds a dedication to the works we know to be Johnson's. This is the dedication to Burney's *Account of the Commemoration of Handel* (1785), quoted before Sir Henry Hadow's chapter on "Music." It is not, however, as is there suggested, Johnson's last published work, since the *Tract on the Corn Laws* was first published in 1808.

A. TILLOTSON.

George Eliot. *Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale. 1819-1854. Influences anglaises et étrangères.* (Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lausanne pour obtenir le grade de docteur ès lettres.) Par P. BOURL'HONNE. Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion. 1933. Pp. 216. Fr. 35.

DR. BOURL'HONNE in his thesis traces George Eliot's development up to 1854, or, more accurately, to the beginning of her liaison with Lewes, which—agreeing here as in some other points with R. H. Hutton—he looks upon as putting a full stop to her spiritual and intellectual development. He indicates, always with admirable clearness, often with acuteness and profundity, the stages through which she passed and the "constancy of character" which gave unity to them and explained the course of her later life. His intention, as he explains in his introduction, was to answer certain questions: "quelle est la raison de la gravité de G. Eliot en face de l'existence, pourquoi nous a-t-elle laissé le message austère qu'elle n'a cessé de répéter pendant toute sa carrière artistique, et quels titres a-t-elle à nous tenir ce langage?" The answers he finds in her earlier history, as it can be made out from her correspondence and from the autobiographical parts of her works. The thread running through her life, as he sees it, is the necessity which she felt of conforming her life to her opinions: did she, he enquires, ever really grow up? The question may appear startling, and Dr.

Bourl'honne may be left to settle it with the great ethical teachers of the world. The statement, without its corollary, may be granted as supplying at least a possible explanation of George Eliot: from her uncompromising determination to reconcile action with opinion came the attempted asceticism of her early religious phase, in which Dr. Bourl'honne, probably rightly, sees no fundamental religious quality but rather an intellectual acceptance of certain dogmas whose abandonment caused her no spiritual pain; from it came the doctrinaire happiness of the years 1842-1849, shattered by her first contact with real grief; and finally, he considers, from it came the decision to live with Lewes, because her reading of Spinoza and, still more, of Feuerbach convinced her that the satisfaction of physical desires is legitimate and even necessary to full spiritual fruition. She had always played with ideas, adopting from this system and that what suited her, and they took their revenge on her. And the rest of her life was an attempt to relieve her conscience of its certainty that she had, in fact, done wrong. Divided in her nature, she could not go on developing happily, but had to set forth, over and over again, with a growing melancholy scarcely lightened by her sense of comedy, the gravest problems of the duties of men and women to themselves, to each other, and to society, and the infinite consequences of a wrong or mistaken decision.

This brief summary does not do justice to a careful and well-documented study. It is possible to disagree with Dr. Bourl'honne, especially on details: thus, cheerfulness surely broke into George Eliot's work more frequently than he will allow. Again, one may fairly protest against the highly speculative footnote on pp. 197-98, where he argues that she may have refused maternity because, in her heart, she could not justify her position; it is equally possible (and more probable) that childlessness may have been a bitter disappointment to her and, illogically perhaps but naturally, increased her sense of moral disquiet. And again, on a different matter, the introduction to the second part of the book contains a sketch of the schools of thought of the mid-nineteenth century, but the remoteness of some of them from George Eliot is not sufficiently emphasized, and it is hardly true to say that her connection with the *Westminster Review* placed her "au centre du mouvement littéraire et philosophique en Angleterre"—it was the centre of one, but not of the only movement, on Dr. Bourl'honne's own showing. Other points of disagreement or question might be raised, but these will suffice.

In spite of them, the book is one which should not be neglected by anyone who is seriously interested in the formation and succession of George Eliot's often apparently contradictory opinions.

EDITH C. BATHO.

English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century. By B. IFOR EVANS. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1933. Pp. xxvi+404. 10s. 6d. net.

IN this book Professor Evans does for the later nineteenth century what Dr. Elton has done for earlier periods: he writes a survey of the second half of the century which embraces all the poets, major and minor, and he achieves something comparable in value with the accomplishment of his predecessor. This is high praise, but it is merited. The book is intended to be a record of his own judgments on the work of the four decades from 1860 to 1900, and his opinions are distinguished by the balance, sanity and critical independence which are the outcome of knowledge and the capacity to use it for comparison and appreciation. He begins his work with a challenge: "The facile generalisation is frequently made that there is little in English poetry between the Pre-Raphaelites and the work of the nineties. Nothing could be more false."

The Introduction gives a concise survey of "the relation of the poetry of the early nineteenth century, to the new forms which emerged in and around 1860," and shows particularly the transition which took place during the decade 1850-1860, and "the changed quality of the new schools of poetry" which followed. "The simplest single perspective can be gained by the generalisation that the old controversy of faith and unfaith recedes from its dominant position as a poetic theme . . . though the debate is a submerged motive until the end of the century. There arises . . . a new religious poetry . . . removed entirely from the earlier disputes, and owing a spiritual allegiance to the religious poetry of the seventeenth century." The Pre-Raphaelites withdraw from all such discussion. "With them romanticism returns," but is narrowed and changed "by the conscious withdrawal from life which characterises the whole group." Mediævalism is employed definitely as an escape. These two schools dominate the period, but it contains much else: Hardy and Meredith, for instance, attempt "to

construct in verse a new synthesis of their belief and of their knowledge, incorporating evolutionary conceptions into their formula."

Poetry during this period is affected by the change in its audience; "the creation and the reading of poetry become esoteric rather than popular: . . . poetry for the larger audience . . . is obviously infected with the tastes of those to whom it is addressed. Yet the history of poetry is not the history of taste; it is not what was once popular, but what has sufficient integrity to remain that matters, and in these decades there emerges a varied body of poetry, traditional and experimental, which survives that ultimate test."

This Introduction forms a key to the scope and treatment of the volume which follows. The seventeen chapters into which it is divided deal with individual poets, *e.g.* Rossetti, Swinburne, Patmore and Allied Poets, Meredith, Hardy, Bridges and his Associates, and with groups, included under such headings as Lighter Verse and Minor Poets. But everywhere the author is obviously guided by the lines he has laid down, so that in spite of his crowded canvas, the picture which emerges is well-composed and unified.

The particular estimates of so many poets will naturally not meet with universal acceptance: unless they were to lose all individuality, that would be impossible. But again and again one is surprised into agreement with an unfamiliar point of view, and when differences of opinion remain, as they must, there is left nevertheless an abiding sense of the critic's sanity and reasonableness. He indulges neither in fire-works nor display: he speaks what he knows as the result of intimate intercourse and the desire to enable others to read with something of his own understanding and delight.

The chapter on Oscar Wilde may serve as an example of Mr. Evans's treatment of an author whose "personality . . . gave his work a far wider influence on the literature and taste of his time, than its intrinsic merit might warrant." The discussion of *The Testament of Beauty* illustrates in a different way the writer's method of arriving at his conclusions and their value when attained. The pages on Bridges are as discriminating as anything in a volume which is full of good things.

With it, space will not allow us to deal in further detail. But the conclusion must not be left unnoticed. It is summed up in Mr. Evans's own final sentences: "In continuity and in contrast the poetry of the later nineteenth century lies in intimate contact with our own age. Even the prosodic experiments of our contemporary

verse find their beginnings tentatively, but surely, within these decades. . . . It is in this belief that our spiritual origins must be found in the nineteenth century, in what we have rejected from that age and in what we have accepted, that [the author has] attempted to trace the history of poetry in that period." The unbroken line of development in English literature is once more convincingly exhibited to the unbeliever.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

Edinburgh Essays on Scots Literature : being a course of Lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh by Members of the English Department and others, with a Preface by H. J. C. GRIERSON. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1933. Pp. xii + 173. 5s. net.

THE sound and even brilliant work contained in this small volume gives a favourable impression of the activity of the younger school of Literature study in Edinburgh. With the notable exception of Dr. W. M. MacKenzie, the writers are all young men. All of them show abundance of the national spirit, but without the extravagant expression of it which has sometimes been prominent of late. The first article, indeed, contains an effective protest against the exaggerated Nationalism which will scarcely admit the debt of Dunbar and Henryson to Chaucer. "Of the essential originality of these Scots poets," says Mr. Harvey Wood, "there is no more earnest advocate than myself; but it is quite impossible to overestimate their debt in inspiration, in form, and in doctrine to their master and original." This occurs in the thoughtful study of Henryson which makes an excellent beginning to the volume. Mr. Wood agrees with the late Professor Gregory Smith in regarding Henryson as a more original poet than Dunbar. Be that as it may, the old schoolmaster of Dunfermline is well worth study.

Dr. MacKenzie's excellent recent edition of Dunbar prepares us for his paper on that poet, which is perhaps the strongest piece of work in the book. His presentation both of the historical setting and of the poet himself could not well be surpassed in so brief compass. He gives a vivid picture of the disappointed and sometimes embittered man, who yet forgets and rises above his troubles when his great hours come, either in the keen vernacular satire of the *Tua Marriit Wemen and the Wedo* or in the gorgeous rhetoric and music of *Ane Ballat of Our Lady*.

Mr. Wellwood's chapter on Reformation and Post-Reformation prose is interesting, though he says little of John Knox, the best known and by far the raciest of these writers. This is partly, perhaps, because Knox, having lived so much abroad, is hardly a typical Scots writer. Opponents like Archbishop Hamilton and James Tyrie taunted him with his English accent and style of writing. He "knapped suddroun"; and to talk "nippit English" has always been unpopular in the North. Mr. Oliver's paper on the Eighteenth-Century Revival makes a fine appeal for Allan Ramsay, and Mr. Kitchin follows with an appreciative study of John Galt. Galt is an unequal writer, but he was a true realist, and *The Entail* and *The Annals of the Parish* ought not to be suffered to fall into neglect.

The last two writers deal with our own day. Mr. Ian Gordon on Modern Scots Poetry and Mr. Angus Macdonald on Modern Scots Novelists have a harder task than their fellow-contributors, because of the sharper differences of opinion on their subjects. Both are entitled to credit. Mr. Gordon is particularly good in his illustrations of the thesis, which is several times emphasized in this volume, that a Scots poet may use English and yet remain Scots. Only a part of Burns himself is in the vernacular; the rest is English, and English, naturally, of the age that Burns lived in. The contrast between the directness and strength of the poet's native speech and what Mr. Gordon calls the "stilted Augustan clichés," to be found even in *The Cottar's Saturday Night*, is felt by every reader of Burns. Mr. Gordon quotes, as a fine example of the reaction from this, a stanza from a living writer, Professor Alexander Gray:

This is my country,
The land that begat me.
These windy spaces
Are surely my own.
And those who here toil
In the sweat of their faces
Are flesh of my flesh
And bone of my bone.

Due recognition is given to the admirable work in recent years of such writers as Charles Murray, Violet Jacob, and Marion Angus, and it is pleasant to know that a younger generation is growing up to succeed them.

Mr. Angus Macdonald, who deals with the novelists, is more controversial. He sets out at once to expose and attack Stevenson's

shortcomings, and a few pages later the whole "Kailyard" school; neither of these nowadays can hit back. He has been a wide and observant reader, but some of the books and authors he refers to are perhaps hardly of sufficient importance to justify the space he gives them. Many of his shrewd comments, however, are true, and so are his observations on the use and abuse of dialect. His summing up will, I think, express the feelings of most readers of this interesting volume—"I do not by any means despair of the future."

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell. By W. M. CLYDE, M.A., Ph.D. London: Humphrey Milford. (St. Andrews University Publications No. 37.) 1934. Pp. xvi+360. 10s. 6d. net.

ALONGSIDE the valuable bibliographical work which has been a feature of our time, there goes an ever-increasing interest in the history of the press in general. In fact the time has almost come when at least an interim bibliography is needed of the work done in this field, to which Dr. Clyde's book is yet another important contribution. His volume is in substance a Ph.D. thesis submitted in 1929 to the University of St. Andrews, and it is in the main a very careful, well-documented, and detailed piece of work.

Although the title gives the limits as "from Caxton to Cromwell," the main theme is the struggle for freedom in the period 1640 to 1658. The struggle in the period 1476 to 1640 is summarily treated: Chapter I traces rapidly the religious motive for control of the press from Henry VIII's day, through the "prelatical tyranny" of the reigns of Elizabeth and her successors, culminating in the "studied malice" of Laud, and it glances at, among other matters, the irregularities and abuses in the printing trade. As an introduction to the main theme, it serves its purpose adequately, but reference to Sheavyn's *Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (Chapters III and IV) and Pollard's *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates* would have helped those not already familiar with this period. Sometimes the summary is liable to mislead: e.g. on p. 10: in Henry VIII's reign "there was as yet no act which required men to obtain permission before proceeding to print," whereas Pollard (pp. 5-6) quotes a proclamation of 1538 forbidding anyone to print without a licence. Again, on p. 2, one would not gather from Dr. Clyde that the stationers had formed themselves into a company

as far back as 1404 (Duff). In fact, Dr. Clyde's direction and contribution in this chapter will be better appreciated after knowing Sheavyn, Pollard, and Duff.

From 1640 to 1658, the activities of Parliament, the Army, the Stationers' Company, and the searchers, in their never completely successful attempts to control writers, printers, booksellers, and hawkers, are fully and clearly chronicled, and the account closes with an agreeable view of Cromwell's tolerance, and his services to literature. The only obscurity in the narrative is in pp. 111-114, where it is by no means clear that we are being given (so I take it) a summary of Hunscoth's petition. Nevertheless, clear though the story is in each successive step, one would have valued a concluding essay to give a bird's-eye view of the direction in which the stepping-stones have taken one.

In so far as he is dealing with the news-journals, Dr. Clyde is covering the same ground as Mr. J. B. Williams in his *History of English Journalism* (1908), but the story is told with such condensation and expansion as are entailed by his attention to his particular theme—the struggle for freedom—and by the new material he adds. Moreover, he has much to say of books and pamphlets, a matter outside Mr. Williams's scope, and here Dr. Clyde stands by himself for the valuable contribution he makes: the later chapters in particular are largely new history. Where Dr. Clyde, however, is covering the same ground as Williams, a knowledge of Williams is an almost essential preliminary to the reader. Dr. Clyde, in fact, has often a laconic style, which sometimes leaves the reader unsatisfied, and sometimes is misleading. Not infrequently it is a matter of omitted dates: e.g. on p. 70, *Mercurius Britanicus* appears abruptly, and one does not know when it started—Dr. Clyde indeed says "the parliamentarian diurnals had had London to themselves since 1641," whereas there was only one diurnal in 1641. Again, on p. 126, we read that "immediately on the appearance of *Pragmaticus* came forth *Anti-Pragmaticus*," where "immediately" is a matter of a month—a fair time with such short-lived periodicals; and this, following on the statement that "there was hardly a royalist mercury that did not have its counter-mercury," is misleading, seeing that, for example, *Pragmaticus* ran till May 28, 1650, and *Anti-Pragmaticus* only till February 3, 1648, while *Anti-Melancholicus* had apparently only one number. Again (p. 127) we read that "other royalist news-books of less importance, *Clericus* and *Diabol-*

icus, were swept away without much difficulty" as a result of the Ordinance of September 1647: the Ordinance was dated September 28 (day not given by Dr. Clyde), and the only number of *Clericus* was September 25 (Williams, p. 235), while *Diabolicus* is not given by Williams, and one would have liked, if possible, a note on it. Likewise (p. 127), we read that a committee was appointed to suppress *Pragmaticus* and *Elencticus*, "the only extant royalist news-books"; but the Index says it was *Pragmaticus* and *Melancholicus* the committee were to suppress, and *Melancholicus* was certainly extant, as is admitted in note 4 to p. 127. Another instance of a misleading statement is on p. 215—that *Democritus* "had long [apparently before August 1652] been a reproach to the Government," whereas it started only on April 8, 1652; also we are told that *Democritus* changed its name to the *Laughing Mercury*, but we are not told that it changed it back again to *Democritus*, though on p. 237 it reappears laconically as *Democritus*. Similar instances (e.g. p. 243 where "about twenty different news-books" is true really of only a few months) could be given to show that a previous knowledge of Williams is necessary if one is not from time to time to be slightly misled, and this matter of one's needing to use Williams a good deal in conjunction with this book is the more important in view of the fact that Dr. Clyde once or twice expresses disagreement with Mr. Williams. Indeed he might have pointed out one or two more differences: e.g. p. 173, where, without referring to his authority, he says that Mabbott resigned on May 7, whereas the implication of Mr. Williams's account is that Mabbott was discharged. Dr. Clyde is shortly to publish a volume dealing with his differences from Mr. Williams in regard to the press and the news of Drogheda and Wexford.

It is not to be thought that Dr. Clyde does not give dates on the whole with great thoroughness, but he certainly might have given a few more in parts: e.g. the account of John Wolfe (pp. 17-20) has no date to place it more exactly. (Reference might be made here to "Wolfe, John, Printer and Publisher, 1579-1601," by Harry R. Hoppe in the *Library*, December, 1933.) Again p. 245, "*Mercurius Aulicus*, revived in March, 1654, etc." would hardly give one the impression that this revival, begun only on March 20, ended on April 3. Similarly, on p. 14, it is by no means clear from "Caley . . . gave up printing at the same time" that 1559 is meant—one might have thought 1566.

Nevertheless, we need not quarrel with Dr. Clyde because we still have to use others, in particular Mr. Williams—such a dependence was no doubt inevitable, and, since it has to be made, it might as well be a little more as a little less, and it in no way detracts from the value of Dr. Clyde's real contribution, which, in giving the whole of the story for the first time, brings to light several works hitherto overlooked, such as Wither's tract, *A Cordial Confection*, an excerpt from which is given among other valuable material in the Appendix.

The Index is thorough and helpful, and it is only as a tribute to it that the following omissions are noted: Audley, 70, 75; Bishop, Zachary, 177; Casaubon, 285; Coles, 75; Gilbert, Claudius, 276; Jennings, 285; Lilburne, 139, 249; Pecke, 72; Peters, Hugh, 184. The only slips noted in the body of the work are: p. 244—for "Secretary of the Army" read "Agent for the Army" (see p. 241); p. 285—for "John Harrington" read "James," and for "1737 edition" read "1700"—so I presume, at least Toland died in 1722. Also in note 1 to p. 143, a better reference would be: "See p. 71."

A. S. COLLINS.

The Place-Names of Northamptonshire. By J. E. B. GOVER, A. MAWER, and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-name Society. Vol. X.) Cambridge: at the University Press. 1933. Pp. lii+311. 18s. net.

The Place-Names of Surrey. By J. E. B. GOVER, A. MAWER, and F. M. STENTON in collaboration with ARTHUR BONNER. (English Place-name Society. Vol. XI.) Cambridge: at the University Press. 1934. Pp. xlvi+445. 21s. net.

THESE two volumes follow the now familiar lines of the work of the English Place-name Society, with two modifications. A change has been made in dealing with the difficult question of the provision of maps. We are now supplied with a map of the county showing the hundreds and parishes and a series of small sketch-maps illustrating the distribution of the most important place-name elements in the county, five for Northamptonshire and six for Surrey. This change of policy is a distinct advance. Nothing short of the full six-inch Ordnance-map serves to show all the names dealt with, and the large maps previously supplied were difficult to manipulate and

could not include the minor names which were just those one desired to look up. The larger map now gives the stranger to the county the relative position of parishes and hundreds, and leaves the enthusiast to seek further detail elsewhere. The distribution maps are a distinct asset, and give useful graphic summaries. A further improvement would be to print them in different colours on thinner paper, fastened in the book, rather than loose in a pocket, so that they could be superimposed and reveal various relative groupings after the method adopted in Fox's *Archæology of the Cambridge Region*.

The second alteration, and one that will be widely welcomed is a fuller treatment of field-names. These are now dealt with in four sections: (a) lost names arranged under the Old and Middle English forms of their chief elements; (b) some common types of field-names not so recorded; (c) miscellaneous; (d) surviving field-names for which evidence has been discovered, arranged under hundreds and parishes. In the Northamptonshire volume, the field-names occupy thirty-four pages, and in that for Surrey, forty-eight pages, as compared with four pages for Devonshire, and seven for Sussex. A further improvement would have been to group the surviving field-names at the end of the section on the parish to which they belong. It is unfortunate, too, that the field-names are not more fully indexed. There is a short index of the more important words used, but the present reviewer has already had difficulty in finding field-names the reference to which he had not noted.

It is impossible, here, to deal critically with the enormous mass of material provided in these volumes. There are, inevitably, *cruces* left unsolved and names about which experts will long differ, but many important and valuable discoveries have been made, and these volumes must for many years remain the standard court of appeal on their subject. Local readers, in particular, will turn eagerly to the articles on the street-names of Northampton and Peterborough, and of those districts of London included in the Surrey volume. It is the fullness of treatment of these minor names that indicates the thoroughness of the search for material, whilst the linguistic and historical acumen of the authors is revealed in the comparative treatment of such names as Britain Sale, Esher, Fastbridge, Goldsworth, etc.

The two volumes form an interesting contrast. In spite of certain relics of Celtic and Roman civilization, the place-names of Surrey are essentially English. Scandinavian and Norman-French

influence is slight. Northamptonshire, on the other hand, still reveals in its place-names traces of conflict between Dane and Saxon. West of Watling Street Scandinavian influence is almost non-existent; to the east, however, it is stronger than was hitherto suspected and some interesting examples of Scandinavianizing are adduced. Saxon elements are replaced by Danish which are attached to Saxon personal-names. Ashton becomes Ashby, and Debden, Debdale. Scandinavian personal-names have replaced Saxon names, and are now compounded with English elements. Kirby is the result of a deliberate renaming, and that at a time when the Vikings had abandoned their heathen beliefs and had adopted Christianity.

Interesting light is thrown on new or rare elements. Some, previously regarded as rare and peculiar to particular districts, are found to be more general than was previously supposed. Others are shown to have a wider meaning; *lundr*, e.g. usually taken to refer to a sacred wood or grove, is used in Northamptonshire of any piece of woodland. Several new elements are found in Surrey; e.g. *prey*, a Middle English word of French origin meaning "meadow," which is found also in the Northamptonshire Delapre, and also in Hampshire.

The Surrey volume includes three appendices: one on "Place-names formed from Animal-Head Names" in which Professor Bruce Dickins brings forward interesting evidence for regarding these names as relics of bloody sacrifice in which a human or animal head was offered to a heathen deity, and two by Mr. Arthur Bonner on "Coldharbour" and "The element *Friday* in place-names." In the first he shows that the majority of the Coldharbours have no relation to Roman roads, and so cannot be relics of Roman roadside inns or caravanserais. They are rather to be compared with such names as *Hungry Farm* and *Mockbeggar Hall*. In the latter is given a list of place-names containing days of the week which reveals the overwhelming preponderance of *Friday*-names. The evidence is admittedly incomplete and no conclusion is reached.

These two volumes maintain in every way the high standard set in previous volumes by the English Place-name Society. They are full of invaluable material for the etymologist, the historian, and the topographer. They are volumes to dip into at leisure, and to study in earnest; for all interested in these counties they will prove invaluable works of reference.

P. H. REANEY.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ELH, Vol. I, December 1934—

Suggestions toward a Genealogy of the *Man of Feeling* (R. S. Crane), pp. 205-30.

Landon and Browning (W. Lyon Phelps), pp. 231-34.

MS. of Landon's sonnet, and an unpublished letter from Browning.

Tate and *The White Devil* (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 235-49.

Nahum Tate and the Seventeenth Century (H. F. Scott-Thomas), pp. 250-75.

Philip Massinger and the Restoration Drama (J. G. McManaway), pp. 276-304.

A Restoration "Improvement" of *Doctor Faustus* (R. H. Perkinson), pp. 305-24.

Contemporary Musical Settings of the Songs in Restoration Drama (R. G. Noyes), pp. 324-44.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 69, November 1934—

AE. *geormanlêaf* und der Name der Germanen (W. Krogmann), pp. 161-79.

Die altenglischen Neunkräutersegen (F. Holthausen), pp. 180-83.
Text and notes.

Studies in the Diction of the *Confessio Amantis* (L. F. Casson), pp. 184-207.

Zum Shakespeare-Text (Vordieck), pp. 208-11.

Notes on *Hamlet*, I. ii. 108 ff.; *Winter's Tale*, II. i. 413, and II. i. 140 ff.

Byron und Napoleon (M. J. Wolff), pp. 212-19.

Tristan und Isolde in der neueren englischen Literatur (A. Ehrentreich), pp. 220-36.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVI., December 1934—

Notes on the Language of John Gower (J. C. Horton Burch), pp. 209-15.

— Vol. XVII., February 1935—

How English was Taught in Jan van Hout's Leyden (A. J. Barnouw), pp. 1-7.

Walraven's translation of Whetstone, *The Honourable Reputation of a Soldier*, as an English primer.

The Use and Distribution of Certain English Sounds (J. R. Firth), pp. 8-18.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 166 (New Series 66), January 1935—

Verstreute me. und frühne. Lyrik (Karl Hammerle), pp. 195-204.
Zwei O & I—Gedichte; Georgstunden; Schülerlied mit Carol.

Studien zum Wortschatz Aelfrics (Schluss) (Paul Meissner), pp. 205-15.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN, Number 6, November 1934—

The Suppressed Edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates* (Lily B. Campbell), pp. 1-16.

Reconsideration of the evidence and of inferences drawn from it.

Hamlet's Book (Hardin Craig), pp. 17-37.

Cardanus's *Comforte*, 1576.

John Hepwith's Spenserian Satire upon Buckingham: With Some Jacobean Analogues (Hoyt H. Hudson), pp. 39-71.

The Reading of Plays during the Puritan Revolution (L. B. Wright), pp. 73-108.

A Tract Long Attributed to Milton (P. S. Havens), pp. 109-14.

Hall's authorship of *A Letter Written to a Gentleman in the Country*, 1653.

Carroll's Withdrawal of the 1865 *Alice* (H. M. Ayres), pp. 153-63.

A Christmas Carol (H. C. Schulz), pp. 165-67.

In a fifteenth-century MS.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIII., October 1934—

Some Emendations in the Chronology of the N.E.D. (P. J. Irwin), pp. 502-05.

Astrology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser (Hugh de Lacy), pp. 520-43.

Milton and Phineas Fletcher (E. C. Baldwin), pp. 544-46.

Parallel between *Paradise Lost*, X. 504-21, and *The Purple Island*, Canto VII.

Rilke and Elizabeth Barrett Browning (Helmut Rehder), pp. 547-59.

On the Etymology of the Word "Monkey" (A. F. Thyagaraju), pp. 560-61.

Borrowed from a Dravidian language by early traders?

LIBRARY, Vol. XV., December 1934—

Nathaniel Ponder: the Publisher of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (F. M. Harrison), pp. 257-94.

The *Locrine* and *George-a-Greene* Title-page Inscriptions (R. C. Bald), pp. 295-305.

Evidence of Buc's authorship.

Was there a 1612 Quarto of *Epicene*? (W. W. Greg), pp. 306-15.

Review of the evidence.

The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers (C. F. Bühler), pp. 316-29.
Relationship of manuscript and early editions.

Milton's *Prolusio* Script (H. C. H. Candy), pp. 330-39.

With facsimiles.

Counterfeit Printing in Jacobean Times (W. A. Jackson), pp. 364-76.

Editions of Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, 1613, Bacon's *Essays*, 1613, and Hayward's *Henry IV*, 1599.

"Milton, N.L.L., and Sir Tho. Urquhart" (H. C. H. Candy), pp. 377-78.

Reply to Mr. Pendleton.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXXI., November 1934—

Letters from George Moore (P. J. Dixon), pp. 14-21.

The Greek Background of *Aphrodite in Aulis*.

— December —

Recollections of Charles Lamb, pp. 146-51.

From a contemporary manuscript. With notes by E. V. Lucas.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. III., October 1934—

Some Principles of Old English Word-order (S. O. Andrew), pp. 167-88.

Two Notes on *Pearl* (Mabel Day), pp. 241-42.

On ll. 140 and 210.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLIX., December 1934—

Thomas Hanmer and the Anonymous Essay on *Hamlet* (Clarence D. Thorpe), pp. 493-98.

Evidence against Hanmer's authorship.

An Elizabethan Ballad of Malmerophus and Sillera (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 498-500.

In Douce collection.

Who was "The Late Arrian"? (George T. Buckley), pp. 500-03.

John Assheton?

The Pejorative Use of *Metaphysical* (R. L. Sharp), pp. 503-05.

Milton, Ibn Ezra, and Wollebius (Maurice Kelley), pp. 506-07.

Source of passages in *De Doctrina Christiana*.

Some Eighteenth-Century Sonnets (R. A. Aubin), pp. 407-09.

From periodicals and anthologies.

James Robertson, Poet and Playwright (B. H. Bronson), pp. 509-11.

A New Letter from Charles Lamb (R. C. Bald), pp. 511-13.

To Mrs. Hazlitt, July 1829.

Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800 (E. Bernbaum), pp. 523-34.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXX., January 1935—

A Manuscript Work by Sir George Buc (R. C. Bald), pp. 1-12.

A Commentary Upon the New Roule of Winchester.

Milton and the Mosaic Law (Arthur Sewell), pp. 13-18.

Changes in Milton's views.

Sir Henry Lee's Entertainment of Elizabeth in 1592 (Clifford Leech), pp. 52-55.

Evidence of manuscript of *Sir Henry Lee's Devices*.

Prester John in Coleridge's *Kubla Khan* (F. J. Warne), pp. 55-58.
A link between Xanadu and Abyssinia.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., November 1934—

A Bibliography of the Writings of George Peele (T. Larsen), pp. 143-56.

With Census of copies of original editions *except* those of *The battle of Alcazar* (1594), *Edward I* (1599), and *David and Bethsabe* (1599).

The Earliest Obituary of Burns: Its Authorship and Influence (J. De Lancey Ferguson), pp. 179-84.

Misrepresentations in Thomson's article as source of the tradition of mental and moral degradation.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 20, Part 2—

Some Observations in connection with B. Trnka: *On the syntax of the English verb from Caxton to Dryden* (A. Dekker), pp. 113-20.

Samuel Pepys and Spain (W. Matthews), pp. 120-29.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 167, November 3, 1934—

Shakespeare and Essex (H. W. Crundell), pp. 316-17.

Evidence against the suggested relation between the Essex conspiracy and *Sir Thomas Moore*.

— November 17—

Notes on Scott's *Count Robert of Paris* (V. R.), pp. 345-47.

Further note by Edward Bensly, December 15, p. 425.

Hamlet: "Yesty collection" (H. W. Crundell), p. 347.

Note on v. ii. 195-202.

Fragment of a letter of Goldsmith (Olybrius), p. 348.

From a bookseller's catalogue.

The Miltonic Epitaph on Mazarin (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 349-50.

Question of authenticity.

English Provincial Playhouses in the Eighteenth Century (A. H. W. Fynmore), p. 356.

At Dover in 1788.

— November 24—

Coleridge Marginalia in the Forster Library (Alice D. Snyder), pp. 362-63.

In Anderson's *Poets of Great Britain*, 1793-1807.

Robert Nowell and Edmund Spenser (W. H. Welply), p. 373.

Reply to note on their relationship.

— December 1—

Comparatives and Superlatives (W. H. J.), pp. 380-81.

Idiomatic usage.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 167, December 8—
 Ss avoided in Verse (L. L.), pp. 398-99.
 Usage of various poets.

— December 15—

The True Story of Burns's Poem, "The Deil's awa' wi' th' Exciseman"
 (E. Heron-Allen), p. 417.
 Account in Burns's letter to John Leven.

— Vol. 168, January 5, 1935—

Two Letters of Colley Cibber (H. P. Vincent), pp. 3-4.
 To Dr. Oliver in 1742.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XIII., October 1934—

The Use of Hall's *Chronicles* in the Folio and Quarto Texts of *Henry VI*
 (Lucille King), pp. 321-32.

Use of Hall rather than Holinshed in *Henry VI*, but not in *The Contention*
 or the *True Tragedy*.

The Date of *The Pilgrim* (Baldwin Maxwell), pp. 350-56.

Topical allusions pointing to end of 1621?

Seneca and the Criticism of Elizabethan Tragedy (A. H. Gilbert),
 pp. 370-81.

Defoe and the Theatre (E. G. Fletcher), pp. 382-89.

Papers in the *Review* urging the suppression of Playhouses.

Browning's *Cenci* (K. L. Knickerbocker), pp. 390-400.

Its relation to its source.

The John Fletcher Holograph (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 401-04.

The First Edition of Arthur Murphy's *Sallust* (J. Homer Caskey),
 pp. 404-08.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
 Vol. XLIX., December 1934—

Old English *Beot* and Old Icelandic *Heitstrenging* (Stefán Einarsson),
 pp. 975-93.

Lord Berners's Translation of Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor*
 (William G. Crane), pp. 1032-35.

Henry Cheke's *Freewyl* (Leicester Bradner), pp. 1036-40.

Evidence of printer and date.

Elizabeth and Literary Patronage (B. B. Gamzue), pp. 1041-49.

Tradition and fact.

Another Interpretation of *Muiopotmos* (Isabel E. Rathborne), pp.
 1050-68.

A New Letter by John Milton (J. Milton French), pp. 1069-70.

To Whitelocke with reference to Mylius and the Count of Oldenburgh.

On the Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Prose Fiction (Franklin
 P. Rolfe), pp. 1071-86.

Including identification of French originals of works listed by Esdaile.

Criticism in Fielding's Narratives and his Estimate of Critics (Richmond C. Beatty), pp. 1087-1100.

Burns's Journal of his Border Tour (J. De L. Ferguson), pp. 1107-15.

Milton and Mirabeau (Don M. Wolfe), pp. 1116-28.

Zola's Literary Reputation in England (C. R. Decker), pp. 1140-53.

Beginning-Consonants and Breath-Control in French and English (James L. Barker), pp. 1166-81.

REVUE DE LITTÉRATURE COMPARÉE, Vol. XV., January 1935—

Marius l'Épicurien de Walter Pater et ses points de départ français, (L. Rosenblatt), pp. 97-106.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., January 1935—

The Rhetorical Inconsistency of Chaucer's Franklin (Benjamin S. Harrison), pp. 55-61.

Rhetoric in Gower's *To King Henry the Fourth, In Praise of Peace* (R. Balfour Daniels), pp. 62-73.

The Sources of *Eikonoklastes*; A Resurvey (George W. Whiting), pp. 74-102.

Three Notes on "Graveyard" Poetry (Robert A. Aubin), pp. 103-09.
Wright's *The Ruins* (1668); *The Relief; or Day Thoughts* (1754); Gilfillan's *Night* (1867).

The Paradox of Burns' Character (Robert T. Fitzhugh), pp. 110-19.
An Echo from Browning's Second Courtship (K. L. Knickerbocker), pp. 120-24.

Autobiographical allusions in the *Pachiarotto* volume.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 1, 1934—

Rich's *Farewell to Military Profession* (James Craigie), p. 755.
Evidence of edition of 1594.

Swithin Wells (Frances A. Yates), p. 755.

Wells, Florio, and the Earl of Southampton.

Milton and the Lark (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 755.

Reply to note on *L'Allegro*; further replies by T. Sturge Moore and B. A. Wright, November 8, p. 775; by H. J. C. Grierson, E. M. W. Tillyard, and M. Joan Sargeant, November 15, p. 795; by B. A. Wright and B. R. Rowbottom, November 22, p. 840; by H. J. C. Grierson and W. A. Jones, November 29, p. 856.

Pride and Prejudice (C. B. Hogan), p. 755.

Use of phrase by Jeremy Taylor and Gibbon.

Rochester on Charles II (Paul G. 'Espinasse), p. 755.
Variant form of epigram.

— November 8—

Two Seventeenth-Century Plays (A. Harbage), p. 775.

Notes on *The Female Rebellion* and *The Bastard*. Further note by A. Watkin-Jones, November 15, p. 795.

A Vox Nihili in Shakespeare (W. Worrall), p. 775.

Suggested emendation of *All's Well*, iv. ii. 73. Reply by A. H. T. Clarke, November 15, p. 795; further note by A. H. T. Clarke, January 3, p. 9.

- Gosse and the Reading Sonnets (Harriet Gaylord), p. 775.
 Evidence of letter of 1927. Replies by John Carter and Clotilda Marson,
 November 15, p. 795; by John Carter, November 22, p. 840.
 Jane Austen and Mrs. Sherwood (W. Roberts), p. 780.
 List of Subscribers to *The Traditions*.

November 15—

- Shirley's *Cupid and Death* (R. G. Howarth), p. 795.
 Early performances and editions.
 The First Person Singular in Jane Austen (D. Rhydderch), p. 795.
 A Skelton Query (Ian A. Gordon), p. 795.
 Identity of Garnesche's 'scribe.'

November 22—

- An Unpublished Poem Attributed to Rochester (V. de Sola Pinto),
 p. 824.
Faith and Reason, preserved among the Verney papers. Note identifying
 poem with the continuation of *Gondibert*, December 6, p. 875; further note
 on Rochester and the Deists, December 6, p. 895.

November 29—

- Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* (Arthur Sewell), p. 856.
 Changes in Milton's religious views. Reply by R. E. C. Houghton,
 December 6, p. 875.

December 6—

- The English Poets, pp. 861-2.
 Collections and anthologies.
 Johnson Letters (R. W. Chapman), p. 875.
 Correct reading of letter of October 6, 1777.
 Coleridge and *The Fall of Hyperion* (J. L. N. O'Loughlin), p. 875.
 Keat's indebtedness to the Allegoric Vision prefixed to *Lay Sermons*.

December 13—

- More Swiftiana (T. F. Higgins), p. 895.
 Advertisements in *Faulkner's Dublin Journal*.
 Philip Sparrow's "Elegy" (Francis Weitzmann), p. 895.
 Skelton's use of the word.
The Winter's Tale and *Pericles* (Gordon Crosse), p. 895.
 Recognition scenes.

December 20—

- Skelton and Politian (William Kerr), p. 909.
Philip Sparrow and *De Angeli puella*.

December 27—

- The Killigrews and Mrs. Corey (A. S. Borgman), p. 921.
 Text of Mrs. Corey's petition.
 "Pereles Pomegarnet" (H. L. R. Edwards), p. 921.
 Skelton's use of the phrase.

"Too Sullied Flesh" (G. M. Young), p. 921.

Objection to emendation. Reply by J. Dover Wilson, January 3, p. 9; notes by W. L. Renwick, January 10, p. 21; by G. M. Young, January 17, p. 33; by J. Dover Wilson, January 24, p. 48.

Cherry-Pit (Frances S. Miller), p. 921.

Eighteenth-Century imitation of Herrick.

January 3, 1935—

The Forged Quartos (Dudley Hutcherson), p. 9.

Further evidence regarding the University of Virginia's volume of Pavier-Jaggard Quartos.

January 10—

A Pope Problem (A. N. L. Munby), p. 21.

Authorship of anonymous pamphlet of 1733.

Milton and that "Learned English Writer" (George W. Whiting),

p. 21.

Reference to Bacon.

January 17—

Shelley's "To Constantia Singing" (Marcel Kessel), p. 33.

Text from notebook in Harvard University Library.

New Light on Skelton (F. M. Salter), p. 33.

Variant version of "On Time" in the Bannatyne MS.

Coleridge's "A Hymn" (S. A. Rochlin), p. 33.

Version published in *The Cape of Good Hope Literary Gazette*, October 1832.

The Public (R. W. Chapman), p. 33.

Eighteenth-Century usage.

A Letter of Charlotte Brontë (M. L. Parrish), p. 33.

To Aylott and Jones, February 1846.

"Fatherless Fanny" (W. Roberts), p. 33.

Authorship and early editions.

January 24—

Spenser's "Action" (Arthur Gray), p. 48.

Marlowe? Further evidence adduced by W. L. Renwick, January 31, p. 62.

De Quincey and Lamb (C. Anderson Scott), p. 48.

Reminiscences in letters of Miss Emily de Quincey.

A Midsummer Night's Dream (Burns Martin), p. 48.

For the double marriage of Lady Elizabeth and Lady Katherine Somerset, 1596?

Horace Walpole (W. S. Lewis), p. 48.

Identification of his contributions to *Old England* and *The Remembrancer*.

"Bishop Blougram's Apology" (C. R. Tracy), p. 48.

Identification of references in ll. 108-9 and 824-33.

January 31—

Sir Walter Raleigh's Prose, pp. 53-54.

Donne and Sir Thomas Roe (R. E. Bennett), p. 62.

Recipient of letter of November 25, 1625.

3, p. 9;
January 17,

Pavie-

(Whiting),

ber 1832.

January 31,

Somerset,

France.